

February 25, 2011

U.S. EPA Great Lakes Restoration Initiative 2011 Request for Applications

Federal Agency Name: Environmental Protection Agency
Funding Opportunity Title: Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Request for Applications
Announcement Type: Request for Applications
Funding Opportunity Number: EPA-R5-GL2011-1
Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 66.469

Overview

This Request for Applications (RFA) solicits applications from eligible entities for grants and/or cooperative agreements to be awarded pursuant to the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Action Plan (http://greatlakesrestoration.us/action/wp-content/uploads/glri_actionplan.pdf). This RFA is EPA's major competitive grant funding opportunity under the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative ("GLRI" or "Initiative") for FY2011 and is one of several funding opportunities available through federal agencies under the GLRI. Applications are requested for projects identified in the RFA within the following four¹ GLRI focus areas:

- Toxic Substances and Areas of Concern, including pollution prevention and cleanup of the most polluted areas in the Great Lakes.
- Invasive Species, including efforts to institute a "zero tolerance policy" toward new invasions.
- Nearshore Health and Nonpoint Source Pollution, including a targeted geographic focus on high priority watersheds and reducing polluted runoff from urban, suburban and, agricultural sources.
- Accountability, Education, Monitoring, Evaluation, Communication and Partnerships, including the implementation of goal- and results-based accountability measures, learning initiatives, outreach, and strategic partnerships.

FUNDING/AWARDS: Approximately \$40 million may be awarded under this RFA for about 150 projects, contingent on the availability of appropriations, the quality of applications received, and other applicable considerations. Subject to these considerations, EPA anticipates awarding grants and/or cooperative agreements, as appropriate, under each of the focus areas described in this RFA; however, EPA reserves the right to make no awards under a particular focus area or make more or less awards than originally anticipated under a focus area. Project periods are generally expected to range from one to three years. Awards may be fully or incrementally funded; all incrementally funded awards will be subject to the availability of funding, future appropriations, satisfactory performance of work, program priorities, and other applicable considerations. Applicants may submit more than one application under this RFA provided that each one is for a different project and is separately submitted.

¹ EPA is not requesting applications under this RFA for the GLRI focus area of Habitat and Wildlife Protection and Restoration. The US Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration are handling applications for that focus area this year.

Authorization for GLRI funding is contained in H.R. 3081, the Continuing Appropriations Act of 2011, which continues applicable authorization under Public Law 111-88, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010. EPA has authority to award grants and cooperative agreements for planning, research, monitoring, outreach and implementation projects in furtherance of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. This authorization may be revised upon expiration of the Continuing Appropriations Act on March 4, 2011.

Governmental entities, including State pollution control agencies, interstate agencies, Tribes, local governments as defined in 40 CFR 31.3, institutions of higher learning (ie, colleges and universities), and non-profit organizations are eligible to apply for funding under this RFA; individuals, foreign organizations and governments, nonprofit organizations exempt from taxation under section 501 (c) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code that lobby and “for-profit” organizations are not eligible.

Important Dates:

- March 9 and March 17, 2011 – Webinars to discuss RFA. See Section IV for further information.
- April 11, 2011 –Applications must be submitted to EPA or through <http://www.grants.gov> by noon, Central Standard Time. See Section IV for further submission information.
- May 2011 – Begin notifying applicants of preliminary selections.
- July 2011 – Begin making official awards.

Dates after April 11, 2011 are expected dates only and may change.

Application Information: Eligible applicants may submit applications electronically through the main RFA web page (<http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/fund/2011rfa01/>) or <http://www.grants.gov/>, pages which will be accessible from <http://www.greatlakesrestoration.us>. The main RFA web page also contains information about asking where to obtain support or to ask clarifying questions, as well as a link to frequently asked questions. We encourage all applicants to register with us at <http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/maillist>. Further submittal information is described in Section IV.

U.S. EPA Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Request for Applications EPA-R5-GL2011-1

CONTENTS

I.	Funding Opportunity Description.....	4
I.A.	Toxic Substances and Areas of Concern	6
I.A.1.	Delist Areas of Concern/Beneficial Use Impairments (7)	
I.A.2.	Pollution Prevention and Toxics Reduction (9)	
I.B.	Invasive Species.....	11
I.B.1.	Invasive Species Control (11)	
I.B.2.	Invasive Species Prevention (12)	
I.B.3.	Early Warning System for Invasive Species (13)	
I.C.	Nearshore Health and Nonpoint Source Pollution	14
I.C.1.	Project Implementation to Make Beaches Safer (14)	
I.C.2.	Reduce Impairments and Stressors of Nearshore Waters (15)	
I.C.3.	Watershed Remediation (16)	
I.C.4.	Green Marinas and Ports (17)	
I.C.5.	Areal Extent and Duration of Harmful Algal Blooms (18)	
I.D.	Accountability, Education, Monitoring, Evaluation, Communication, and Partnerships	19
I.D.1.	Education and Outreach (19)	
I.D.2.	Implement Lakewide Management Plan Projects (19)	
II.	Award Information	20
III.	Eligibility Information	22
IV.	Application and Submission Information	25
V.	Application Review, including General Criteria, Review Process, Schedule	34
VI.	Award Administration	39
VII.	Agency Contacts.....	42
VIII.	Other Information	42
	Appendix I – Lakewide Management Plan Priorities and Goals	I-1
	Appendix II – Grants.gov instructions.....	II-1
	Appendix III – Budget Sample	III-1

U.S. EPA Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Request for Applications EPA-R5-GL2011-1

I. Funding Opportunity Description.

Introduction and Background

This RFA solicits applications from eligible entities for grants and/or cooperative agreements to be awarded pursuant to the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Action Plan (available from <http://greatlakesrestoration.us>) and the statutory authority referenced below. Approximately \$40 million may be awarded under this RFA for about 150 projects contingent on the availability of appropriations, the quality of applications received, and other applicable considerations. Applications are requested for the categories of activities specified in the RFA within four² of the five major focus areas of the GLRI:

- Toxic Substances and Areas of Concern, including pollution prevention and cleanup of the most polluted areas in the Great Lakes.
- Invasive Species, including efforts to institute a “zero tolerance policy” toward new invasions.
- Nearshore Health and Nonpoint Source Pollution, including a targeted geographic focus on high priority watersheds and reducing polluted runoff from urban, suburban and, agricultural sources.
- Accountability, Education, Monitoring, Evaluation, Communication and Partnerships, including the implementation of goal- and results-based accountability measures, learning initiatives, outreach and strategic partnerships.

The President and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), in conjunction with 15 other federal organizations, have made restoring the Great Lakes a national priority. The Initiative builds on the prior efforts of agency, business, public interest, and other leaders which resulted in the February 2010 Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Action Plan. This RFA represents EPA’s major competitive grant funding opportunity under the Initiative for FY2011 and is one of several funding opportunities available through participating federal organizations.

This RFA is expected to result in the award of grants and/or cooperative agreements (referred to collectively as “grants” hereafter), as appropriate, to implement a portion of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. Authorization for GLRI funding is contained in H.R.3082 -- Continuing Appropriations and Surface Transportation Extensions Act, 2011, which continues applicable authorization under Public Law 111-88, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010. EPA has authority to award grants and/or cooperative agreements for planning, research, monitoring, outreach and implementation projects in furtherance of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. Such authorization may be revised upon expiration of the Continuing

² EPA is not requesting applications under this RFA for the GLRI focus area of Habitat and Wildlife Protection and Restoration. The US Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration are handling applications for that focus area this year. See also <http://www.sustainourgreatlakes.org>

Appropriations Act on March 4, 2011. Information about the Initiative can be found at <http://greatlakesrestoration.us/>.

Funded activities will advance protection and restoration of the Great Lakes ecosystem in support of (i) the [Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Action Plan](http://greatlakesrestoration.us/action/wp-content/uploads/glri_actionplan.pdf) (see http://greatlakesrestoration.us/action/wp-content/uploads/glri_actionplan.pdf) and (ii) Sub-objective 4.3.3 (Improve the Health of Great Lakes ecosystems) of EPA's Strategic Plan <http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/plan.htm>.

Under the focus areas in this RFA, EPA is particularly interested in projects which:

- (i) facilitate the creation of new jobs through such means as implementation projects using a civilian conservation corps model for environmental restoration;
- (ii) promote environmental justice by helping to address disproportionate environmental impacts on communities; and/or
- (iii) engage and work with community-based organizations (as defined in this RFA) and other appropriate parties to address the concerns of local communities.

The statutory authority for the awards to be made under this RFA is expected to be comparable to that contained in the Administrative Provisions of Title II of the 2010 Appropriations Act, which authorizes grants "...for planning, research, monitoring, outreach, and implementation in furtherance of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement." However, this authorization, and consequently the scope of this RFA if necessary, may be revised upon expiration of the current Continuing Appropriations Act on March 4, 2011. The Statutory Authority to take action to implement the U.S. responsibilities under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, which these awards will support, is contained in Section 118(c) of the Clean Water Act. The principal goal of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement is the restoration and maintenance of the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Great Lakes ecosystem. For projects with international aspects the above statutes are supplemented, as appropriate, by the National Environmental Policy Act, Section 102(2)(F).

Applicants may submit more than one application under this RFA provided that each one is for a different project and is separately submitted. Each application must address only one focus area and one category under a focus area. While applications requesting funding below or above any estimated minimum or maximum individual project amounts identified in Section I for the different project activities will be considered, EPA encourages applicants to submit applications that are not below or do not exceed any such minimum or maximum individual project amounts described below. Categories of activities under each focus area are described in Section I. The expected award amounts and the relative allocations for categories of activities are approximations which are subject to change based upon applicable considerations including, but not limited to, EPA's determination that different amounts or allocations would better advance protection and restoration of the Great Lakes ecosystem.

As used in this RFA:

1. The term "**community-based organization**" means a nongovernmental organization that has demonstrated effectiveness as a representative of a community or a significant segment of a

community and that helps members of that community or segment obtain environmental, educational, or other social services. A community-based organization must be a nonprofit or not for profit corporation in good standing under state or tribal law with authority to enter into binding legal agreements. The community-based organization need not be tax exempt under the Internal Revenue Code but may use documentation of tax exempt status to demonstrate that is a nonprofit. Nonprofit organizations exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code that lobby are not eligible to receive grants or subgrants under this RFA. See evaluation factor D in Section V of this RFA.

2. The term “**output**” means an environmental activity, effort, and/or associated work product related to an environmental goal and objective that will be produced or provided over a period of time or by a specified date. Outputs may be quantitative or qualitative but must be quantifiable and measurable during a grant funding period.

3. The term “**outcome**” means the result, effect or consequence that will occur from carrying out an environmental activity that is related to an environmental or programmatic goal or objective. Outcomes may be environmental, behavioral, health-related, or programmatic in nature, but must be quantitative. They need not be achievable within a grant funding period.

REQUESTS WITHIN FOCUS AREAS

Applications are requested for the categories of activities described below for the respective Focus Areas.

I.A. Request for Applications - Toxic Substances and Areas of Concern.

General Background. While certain persistent toxic substances have been significantly reduced in the Great Lakes ecosystem over the past 30 years, they continue to be present at levels above those considered safe for humans and wildlife, warranting fish consumption advisories in all five Great Lakes and the Connecting Channels. Indigenous communities and others who frequently consume Great Lakes fish are most at risk from fish contamination. Continuing sources of persistent toxic substances include releases from contaminated sediments; industrial and municipal point sources; nonpoint sources including atmospheric deposition, agricultural and urban runoff, and contaminated groundwater; and cycling of these substances within the Lakes.

In addition to the well-known persistent toxics like polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), mercury and banned pesticides, there are chemicals of emerging concern that have been detected in the Great Lakes over the past several years which may pose threats to the health of the ecosystem. Some such chemicals are found in pharmaceuticals and personal care products for which there is very little environmental information. To protect human and ecosystem health against future threats, these substances must be better understood with respect to their potential hazards and routes of exposure, with any necessary actions taken in a timely fashion.

Efforts to restore the degraded conditions in the U.S. Great Lakes Areas of Concern (AOCs <http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/aoc>) are underway. These efforts include remediation of contaminated sediments under the Great Lakes Legacy Act

(<http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/sediments.html>). To support the additional work that needs to be done to remove beneficial use impairments (BUIs) in the Great Lakes AOCs and to make progress towards achieving the goals, objectives, and targets identified for this focus area in the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Action Plan, EPA is requesting applications for projects as described below.

I.A.1. Delist Areas of Concern/Beneficial Use Impairments. EPA expects to provide approximately \$12,000,000 for approximately 15 to 25 projects in amounts up to \$2,000,000 to remove [Beneficial Use Impairments](#) (BUIs) (see <http://www.epa.gov/glwqa/1978/annex.html#ANNEX%202>) for Great Lakes Areas of Concern (AOCs). EPA is especially interested in (i) on-the ground action that leads to achieving the AOC/BUI delisting targets identified in the February 21, 2010 Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Action Plan; and (ii) a single award for coordination and oversight of the Eighteenmile Creek (New York) Remedial Action Plan (RAP).

Projects under this category must support removal of one or more of the following 12 BUIs:

- a. Restrictions on fish and wildlife consumption.
- b. Tainting of fish and wildlife flavor.
- c. Fish tumors or other deformities.
- d. Bird or animal deformities or reproduction problems.
- e. Restrictions on dredging activities.
- f. Eutrophication or undesirable algae.
- g. Restrictions on drinking water consumption, or taste and odor problems.
- h. Beach closings.
- i. Degradation of aesthetics.
- j. Added costs to agriculture or industry.
- k. Degradation of phytoplankton and zooplankton populations.
- l. Degradation of benthos.

Applications for which the principal purpose is removal of Habitat BUIs³ are not eligible under this category. Applications for which the principal purpose is implementation of a plan for Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) are not eligible under this category, but must be submitted under category I.C.3 (Watershed Remediation).

For a project to be eligible under this category, applicants **must** either (i) include a letter indicating that the applicable State agency⁴ supports the project because it will lead to removal of

³ Habitat BUIs are not specifically addressed in this RFA, but are addressed through the Sustain Our Great Lakes program <http://www.sustainourgreatlakes.org/>. Funding may also be available from and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The Habitat Beneficial Use Impairments are: Degraded Fish and Wildlife Populations and Loss of Fish and Wildlife Habitat.

⁴ The respective State agencies and contacts are:

- Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (Contact: Tammy.Mitchell@illinois.gov)
- Indiana Department of Environmental Management, Northwest Regional Office (Contact: dbarnett@idem.IN.gov)

one or more BUIs or to AOC delisting or (ii) explain why the project should be eligible without such evidence of support.

Projects should implement the actions identified in the Stage 2 Remedial Action Plans, or their equivalents, to achieve BUI removal targets.

Information about AOCs and RAPs is available from:

- <http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/aoc/rap.html>
- <http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/aoc/rapdelistingfinal02.PDF> (Delisting Principles and Guidelines)
- <http://www.glc.org/rap/resources/>

Applications for this area should include the following information as applicable:

- i. for each BUI identified as impaired:
 - A. a statement of proposed, quantifiable environmental results,
 - B. detailed descriptions of all remedial and restoration actions required for BUI removal, including requisite coordination,
 - C. a cost estimate and schedule for each of these actions, including the identification of additional funding sources, as needed, and
 - D. a detailed description and cost estimate of post-remedial monitoring, as necessary, to satisfy BUI removal criteria, including specific monitoring needs which cannot be supported by existing monitoring programs.
- ii. for BUIs of unknown status:
 - A. a detailed description and cost estimate of the monitoring required to definitively determine the status of a BUI (sufficient to lead to a definitive change in the use impairment status, for example from “unknown” to either “impaired”, “unimpaired”, or “attributable to sources outside the AOC”) and
 - B. an outline of proposed remedial actions (as above) that would be required for BUI removal should monitoring results indicate impairment.

Applicants should indicate how other work, including work conducted under other EPA authorities such as the Great Lakes Legacy Act, Superfund, or RCRA, will complement, but not duplicate the proposal to remove BUIs.

-
- Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment – Office of the Great Lakes (Contact: hobrlar@michigan.gov)
 - Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (Contact: marc.hershfield@pca.state.mn.us)
 - New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Great Lakes Programs Coordinator (Contact: dezela@dec.state.ny.us)
 - Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, Division of Surface Water (Contact: gail.hesse@epa.state.oh.us)
 - Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, Office of the Great Lakes (Contact: lboughton@state.pa.us)
 - Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Office of the Great Lakes (Contact: Stephen.Galarneau@Wisconsin.gov)

The expected Eighteenmile Creek award is to be for a total of approximately \$500,000 over 5 years-projects should specify the work that would be done incrementally over a 5 year period for a budget of up to \$100,000 annually and should address tasks associated with the implementation of the RAP strategy(s) in support of Area of Concern (AOC) delisting, including tracking and coordination activities and remediation and ecosystem restoration. Such tasks may include, but are not limited to, developing and coordinating monitoring plans and continued data assessment of beneficial use impairments; and coordinating the review of delisting determinations for individual beneficial use impairments, through the Remedial Action Committee, the State, and EPA.

Outputs from the projects under this category should include one or more of the following:

- Delisting of Areas of Concern or measurable progress toward delisting.
- Implementation of projects, or a list of projects, leading to removal of one or more BUIs or progress towards achieving a beneficial use in one or more AOCs.
- Collection and analysis of monitoring data allowing for an AOC re-designation into Recovery Stage, or re-evaluation of existing BUIs to determine if they are still applicable.
- Development of monitoring and supporting strategies to determine if restoration activities have achieved stated BUI removal targets.
- Collection and analysis of monitoring data allowing for the formal Stage 3 delisting document for an AOC.

Applicants must also demonstrate how their proposed project will achieve one or more of the following outcomes:

- Environmental levels of toxic chemicals in AOCs are reduced to the point that restrictions on the consumption of Great Lakes fish can be lifted.
- The health and integrity of wildlife populations in AOCs are protected from adverse chemical and biological effects associated with the presence of toxic substances in the Great Lake ecosystem.
- Areas of Concern are cleaned up, restoring the areas and removing applicable Beneficial Use Impairments.
- Sources of drinking water in the Great Lakes ecosystem from both ground and surface waters are better protected through improved management of toxic substances.
- Ecosystem resilience is increased, improving the capabilities of ecosystems to adapt to changes in climate.

I.A.2. Pollution Prevention and Toxics Reduction. EPA expects to provide approximately \$3,000,000 for approximately 10 to 20 projects in amounts up to \$500,000 for Great Lakes pollution prevention and toxics reduction activities. Projects should reduce the risk that toxic contaminants will enter the Great Lakes ecosystem. In addition, if appropriate, projects which reduce toxics in the Great Lakes may also reduce energy use, conserving or offsetting BTUs or kilowatt hours, and/or reduce water usage in the Great Lakes ecosystem. Projects submitted under this category **must** include one or more of the following:

- Actions delivering toxic reductions/pollution prevention for substances targeted by the Great Lakes Binational Toxics Strategy and/or the EPA Chemical Action Plans (<http://www.epa.gov/opptintr/existingchemicals/pubs/ecactionpln.html>) to the extent that those substances may pose threats to the Great Lakes. Applicants should include a link or name the applicable contaminants.
- Reductions in the use of mercury in products and better management of mercury product wastes. During the evaluation process described in Section V of the RFA, the degree to which the project helps states, tribes, and local governments implement the recommendations of the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration's Mercury in Product Phase-down Strategy (<http://glrc.us/documents/MercuryPhaseDownStrategy06-19-2008.pdf>) will be considered under the evaluation criteria for "Strategic Approach."

Ineligible activities under this category include remedial actions to remove/remediate contaminated sediment, soil, debris, or other materials; or erosion control measures. See RFA Section III for other ineligible activities.

Outputs from the projects under this category should include one or more of the following:

- Removal of measurable amounts (pounds) of toxic substances from the Great Lakes ecosystem.
- Prevention of measurable amounts (pounds) of toxic substances from being released into the Great Lakes ecosystem.
- In addition, if appropriate, projects which reduce toxics in the Great Lakes may also reduce energy use, conserve or offset BTUs or kilowatt hours, and/or reduce water usage in the Great Lakes ecosystem.

Applicants must also demonstrate how their proposed project will achieve one or more of the following outcomes:

- Fewer toxic contaminants enter the Great Lakes ecosystem.
- Increased safe reuse and recycling of toxic materials.
- The release of toxic substances in toxic amounts is prevented or reduced and the release of any or all persistent toxic substances to the Great Lakes ecosystem is virtually eliminated.
- Exposure to toxic substances from historically-contaminated sources is significantly reduced through source reduction and other exposure reduction methods.
- Environmental levels of toxic chemicals are reduced to the point that restrictions on the consumption of Great Lakes fish can be lifted.
- The health and integrity of wildlife populations and habitat are protected from adverse chemical and biological effects associated with the presence of toxic substances in the Great Lake ecosystem.

I.B. Request for Applications - Invasive Species.

General Background. Progress toward restoring the Great Lakes has been significantly undermined by the effects of non-native invasive species. Over 180 non-native species now exist in the Great Lakes. The most invasive of these propagate and spread, ultimately degrading habitat, out-competing native species, and short-circuiting food webs. Prevention is the most cost-effective approach to dealing with organisms that have not arrived and could potentially threaten the lakes. New invasive species can be introduced into the Great Lakes region through various pathways, including: commercial shipping, canals and waterways, trade of live organisms, and activities of recreational and resource users. Climate change considerations are an important component of long term prevention and control strategies. Once invasive species establish a foothold in the Great Lakes, they are virtually impossible to eradicate, but in some cases, can be controlled to reduce impacts on the Great Lakes ecosystem. Advanced technology and innovative management practices can significantly reduce the cost of control.

Prevention and control efforts must be accelerated in order to prevent new introductions of invasive species and to minimize the further spread of the organisms to inland lakes, the Mississippi River watershed, and beyond. Federal Agencies need to work with state, tribal, and local governments, academic institutions, industry, and non-governmental organizations to:

1. Control and reduce the spread of invasive species already in the Great Lakes ecosystem, through enhanced on-the-ground and in-the-water efforts.
2. Stop the introduction of new non-native invasive species into the Great Lakes through enhanced prevention programs.

To address these issues and make progress towards achieving the goals, objectives, and targets identified for this focus area in the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Action Plan, EPA is soliciting applications for projects as described below.

I.B.1. Invasive Species Control. EPA expects to provide approximately \$2,800,000 for approximately 5 to 10 projects in amounts up to \$600,000 to eradicate and control invasive species already present in the Great Lakes ecosystem. Projects should implement on-the-ground and in-the-water invasive species control.

Applications should describe a strategic approach that identifies the ecological significance of the project location; estimates the short and long-term ecological impact of the proposed effort; uses a multi-organizational approach to implementation, including working with relevant governmental agencies, where appropriate; demonstrates measurable progress; includes public stewardship opportunities; and establishes efforts that will help maintain the project site beyond the project period. Control efforts may use well-established techniques and/or demonstrate the use of new or innovative technologies to achieve results.

Outputs from the projects under this category should include one or more of the following:

- Control of the number of invasive species populations in the Great Lakes ecosystem to a target level, area managed, or quantity of species removed.

- Implementation of multi-agency rapid response plans, mock exercises to practice responses under those plans, and/or actual response actions.
- Implementation of projects that demonstrate innovative control measures.

Applicants must also demonstrate how their proposed project will achieve one or more of the following outcomes:

- Jurisdictional authorities demonstrate an enhanced capability to effectively respond to new detections of invasive species.
- Invasive species populations are rapidly controlled, reduced, and/or eradicated within the Great Lakes ecosystem using site-specific rapid response plans.
- Invasive species populations are controlled, reduced, and/or eradicated within the Great Lakes ecosystem consistent with existing fish, wildlife, and other ecosystem plans/strategies.

I.B.2. Invasive Species Prevention. EPA expects to provide approximately \$1,500,000 for approximately 4 to 8 projects ranging in amounts up to \$400,000 that will prevent new introductions of invasive species into the Great Lakes ecosystem. Projects should prevent introductions of live invasive species through domestic commerce and international trade (including the accidental importation of unintended species), reduce the spread of invasive species via canals and waterways, and/or promote safe recreation and resource use. Prevention efforts may use well-established techniques and/or demonstrate the use of new or innovative technologies to achieve results.

Applications should describe a strategic approach that identifies relevant vectors of introduction; estimates the significance of the vector to the project area; estimates the net impact of the proposed prevention activities on the vector; uses a multi-organizational approach to implementation, including working with relevant governmental agencies, where appropriate; demonstrates measurable progress; includes public stewardship opportunities; and helps establish prevention efforts that will continue beyond the project period.

Outputs from the projects under this category should include:

- Completion of projects that implement prevention measures for vectors/pathways including, but not limited to (a) preventing the release of live invasive species in domestic commerce and international trade, (b) reducing the spread of invasive species through canals/waterways, and/or (c) promoting safe recreation and resource use).

Applicants must also demonstrate how their proposed project will achieve one or more of the following outcomes:

- The rate of non-native species newly detected in the Great Lakes ecosystem is reduced.
- The spread of invasive species by means of recreational activities and canals and waterways beyond their current range is prevented.
- The risk of introduction of species imported for various uses is identified and minimized in the Great Lakes ecosystem.

I.B.3. Early Warning System for Invasive Species. EPA expects to provide approximately \$500,000 for approximately 1 to 3 projects in amounts up to \$500,000 to advance development of a comprehensive program for detection and tracking newly identified invasive species in the Great Lakes. Projects should complement initial work done through the Invasive Species Initiative of EPA's Office of Research and Development (EPA-ORD), including work done in Duluth-Superior Harbor (DSH) by EPA-ORD and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), to design and pilot early detection monitoring networks. Great Lakes environmental managers are developing a model for a Great Lakes basin-wide early detection monitoring design/program using the Duluth-Superior Harbor (DSH) as an initial case study of a highly vulnerable embayment/river system.

Projects should support additional complementary studies at locations elsewhere in the Great Lakes that will, along with DSH results, lead to a collaborative surveillance and early detection approach that can be implemented basin-wide with statistical confidence. Biological components which may be collected include invertebrates, plankton, pathogens, fish, and/or aquatic vegetation.

Outputs from the projects under this category should include one or more of the following:

- Development and piloting of methodology and protocols for coordinated basin-wide invasive species monitoring.
- Assessment of the effect of sampling equipment on final outcomes. (More than one type of sampling equipment could be considered if the design will allow a comparison in spatial/effort optimization analyses.)
- Collaboration on analyses that use data to optimize sampling for multiple species to detect rare invasive species present at low abundance levels.
- Exploration of oversampling strategies (e.g., assessing whether a high percentage of all taxa in the chosen biological component are captured) to inform the development of optimal and efficient basin-wide surveillance.
- Use or development of genetic techniques to identify taxa from complex mixtures to supplement or replace traditional morphological taxonomy.

Applicants must also demonstrate how their proposed project will achieve one or more of the following outcomes:

- A comprehensive program for detection and tracking newly identified invasive species in the Great Lakes is developed to provide up-to-date critical information needed by decision makers for evaluating potential rapid response actions.
- There is enhanced surveillance of coastal ecosystems along the U.S. Great Lakes shore for multiple species.
- Taxonomic analyses are provided for benthic invertebrates, plankton, pathogens, adult fish (or larvae), and/or aquatic vegetation.

I.C. Request for Applications - Nearshore Health and Nonpoint Source Pollution.

General Background. The nearshore environment includes both aquatic and terrestrial features which extend variable distances away from the land-water intersection. This is the area in which most residents and visitors interact with the Great Lakes. The nearshore waters of the Great Lakes are a primary source of drinking water, supplier of fish for both personal and commercial benefit, and a recreational outlet for millions of U.S. residents and visitors. Nearshore water quality has become degraded, as evidenced by eutrophication resulting from excessive nutrients; harmful algal blooms; mats of *Cladophora* on beaches; avian botulism; and beach closings. Causes of these problems include excessive nutrient loadings from both point and nonpoint sources, bacteria and other pathogens, development and shoreline hardening, agricultural practices, failing septic systems, improper grey-water discharge, inadequate pump-out stations for recreational boats, and invasive species.

Nonpoint sources are now the primary contributors of many pollutants to the Great Lakes and their tributaries. Although some nonpoint sources act on a whole-basin scale (e.g., atmospheric deposition of toxic substances) many smaller scale sources contribute to degraded water quality in Great Lakes tributaries and nearshore waters. The complexity of the pollutants and their presence in soil, water and air make pollution abatement for nonpoint sources particularly difficult to address. Control strategies to date have been inadequate to deliver the degree of stream and lake restoration necessary for the protection and maintenance of the Great Lakes. However, implementation of best management practices can have multiple benefits, including simultaneous reductions in runoff of soils, nutrients, pesticides, and other nonpoint source pollutants.

To address these issues and make progress towards achieving the goals, objectives, and targets identified for this focus area in the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Action Plan, EPA is soliciting applications for projects as described below.

I.C.1. Project Implementation to Make Beaches Safer. EPA expects to provide approximately \$8,000,000 for approximately 8 to 30 projects in amounts ranging from \$50,000 to \$1,000,000 to implement actions to reduce or eliminate sources of contamination that have been identified through, or are consistent with, sanitary surveys at Great Lakes beaches.

EPA is requesting applications to begin actions to reduce or eliminate the sources of contamination identified at Great Lakes beaches. EPA especially encourages projects to be performed in the 30 U.S./Binational Areas of Concern such that any project will assist in removal of Beach Closing (including recreational contact) BUIs.

Projects should be designed to reduce risk to human health at Great Lakes swimming beaches by developing and implementing projects to reduce, manage, or eliminate contamination sources that have been identified through the use of beach sanitary surveys, such as those funded in EPA's FY 2010 GLRI Request for Proposals, or equivalent documentation. Applicants should specify the problem to be resolved as well as the proposed solution as requested in RFA Section IV.C.2.A. Projects submitted under this category may include one or more of the following:

- Installation of stormwater infiltration systems near Great Lakes beach areas with persistent problems.
- Implementation of green stormwater infrastructure approaches that can reduce, capture, and treat stormwater runoff at its source.
- Reduction or removal of impervious surfaces near beach areas.
- Re-grading of beach areas and/or adjacent parking lots.
- Diversion/filtration of stormwater runoff at beach areas through installation of swales or rain gardens.
- Implementation of waterfowl management measures to prevent landing/congregation at beaches.
- Mitigation of human or animal waste products that contribute or encourage bacteria and/or other pathogens in the water or on the beach.

Outputs from the projects under this category should include one or more of the following:

- Reduction in the number of pollution sources impacting Great Lakes beaches.
- Reduction in the number of Great Lakes beach closures or advisories issued.
- Documentation of mitigation measures taken and outcomes achieved which can be applied at other Great Lakes beaches.
- Reduction in nuisance algal blooms and ambient water concentrations of nitrogen and phosphorus in Great Lakes coastal areas.

Applicants must also demonstrate how their proposed project will achieve one or more of the following outcomes:

- Water quality is improved at Great Lakes beaches due to reductions in bacteriological, algal, and chemical contamination.
- Protection of public health is improved at Great Lakes beaches.
- Holistic watershed approaches to Great Lakes beach management are implemented, supporting a more efficiently directed beach program.

I.C.2. Reduce Impairments and Stressors of Nearshore Waters. EPA expects to provide approximately \$1,000,000 for approximately one to five projects in amounts up to \$1,000,000 to mitigate causative agents that lead to impairments of the aquatic nearshore ecosystem (e.g., *Cladophora* growths, harmful algal blooms, outbreaks of avian botulism, eutrophication, suspended sediment).

Projects should reduce or eliminate the number and severity of incidences of nearshore nuisance problems such as *Cladophora* growth, harmful algal blooms (HABs), botulism, and other eutrophication-related issues. The geographic extent could include anywhere the causal agents exist that are known to impair Great Lakes nearshore waters. EPA is especially interested in *projects that reduce or eliminate impairments at U.S./binational Areas of Concern or at the geographic areas targeted in the GLRI Action Plan (Fox River, Saginaw River, Maumee River, St. Louis River, and Genesee River) for non-point source pollution control measures.*

Outputs from the projects under this category should include one or more of the following:

- Reduction in measurable nutrient loadings to the Great Lakes.
- Reduction in the extent and severity of Great Lakes algal blooms.
- Reduction in miles of Great Lakes coastline negatively impacted by Cladophora growth.
- Reduction in the extent and/or severity of incidences of avian botulism.

Applicants must also demonstrate how their proposed project will achieve one or more of the following outcomes:

- Nearshore Great Lakes aquatic communities that consist of healthy, self-sustaining plant and animal populations dominated by native species are restored.
- The presence of bacteria, viruses, pathogens, nuisance growths of plants or animals; objectionable taste or odors in drinking water; and other risks to human health are reduced to levels that do not impede human use and enjoyment of Great Lakes nearshore areas.

I.C.3. Watershed Remediation. EPA expects to provide approximately \$7,500,000 for approximately 10 to 15 projects to accelerate watershed remediation. The maximum amount of federal funds that will be awarded for any project in this category is \$1,000,000.

To be eligible under this category, applications **must**:

- propose a project to implement best management practices and management measures contained in State approved Nine Element Watershed Management Plans, TMDL implementation plans or in other watershed management plans that are consistent with the components outlined in Section 2.6 of EPA's Handbook for Developing Watershed Plans to Restore and Protect Our Waters (http://water.epa.gov/polwaste/nps/handbook_index.cfm);
- identify specific components of such a plan that would be implemented within three years; and
- estimate the expected environmental results from the three-year implementation period.

Watershed-based plans that are consistent with the components outlined in EPA's Nine Elements Guidance are designed to address documented nonpoint source-related water quality problems and to help prevent future nonpoint source water quality-related problems. Such plans are based upon sound science and evaluation techniques; have measurable outcomes; are developed with stakeholder/public involvement; and leverage additional resources. The approved Nine Element Watershed Management Plans can be found at:

- Illinois: <http://www.watershed.uiuc.edu/>
- Indiana: <http://www.state.in.us/idem/4342.htm>
- Michigan: http://www.michigan.gov/deq/0,1607,7-135-3313_3682_3714_4012-95955--_00.html
- Minnesota: <http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/water/water-types-and-programs/surface-water/basins-and-watersheds/watershed-management-plans.html>
- New York: <http://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/23844.html>
- Ohio: http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/H_Nav2/Water/WatershedCoordinator/tabid/9192/Default.aspx

- Pennsylvania: http://www.depweb.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/watershed_planning/10593
- Wisconsin: <http://dnr.wi.gov/water/watersheds/>

Monitoring activities are not eligible for funding. GLRI funded watershed projects will instead be incorporated into the applicable State's ongoing nonpoint source monitoring efforts. EPA will work with States to schedule monitoring based upon project performance of load reduction goals. The impact of ongoing implementation will be estimated through a Spreadsheet Tool for Estimating Pollutant Load (STEPL) which employs algorithms to calculate the load reductions that would result from implementation of various best management practices.

Outputs from the projects under this category should include one or more of the following:

- Reduction in nutrient inputs (source reduction and/or loadings) to Great Lakes tributaries and nearshore waters.
- Reduction in sediment inputs (source reduction and/or loadings) to Great Lakes tributaries and nearshore waters.
- Reduction in concentrations of soluble reactive phosphorus in major Great Lakes tributaries, especially during critical spring and summer storm events.
- Removal of BUIs and/or delisting of Clean Water Act Section 303(d) impairments in the Great Lakes.
- Reduction in the number of incidences of harmful algal blooms, avian botulism, and/or excessive *Cladophora* growth (from 2008 levels, 2007 for Lake Michigan) in the Great Lakes ecosystem.
- Increase in the percentage of agricultural lands in conservation and/or utilizing conservation tillage practices in the Great Lakes ecosystem.

Applicants must also demonstrate how their proposed project will achieve one or more of the following outcomes:

- Soil erosion and the loading of sediments, nutrients, and pollutants into Great Lakes tributaries are significantly reduced.
- Nearshore Great Lakes aquatic resources are protected/enhanced/restored.
- Trophic status and/or biotic integrity in Great Lakes stream or lake water quality is improved.

I.C.4 Green Marinas and Ports. EPA expects to provide approximately \$200,000 for one to three projects in amounts up to \$200,000 to reduce or eliminate non-point source pollution and toxic substances entering the Great Lakes through marina activities. Projects should establish Green Marina or Green Port programs or improve and expand existing Green Marina programs by implementing consistent best practices for marinas or ports in the Great Lakes region; creating uniform certification standards for marinas, boatyards, harbors, or ports; and expanding online training and education to transfer best practices to boaters, marina operators, or port managers.

Outputs from the projects under this category should include one or more of the following:

- Development of consistent educational materials, best management practices guidance and certification criteria for marinas, boatyards, harbors, or ports throughout the Great Lakes region.
- Increase in the number of Certifications of Green Marina facilities in the Great Lakes region.

Applicants must also demonstrate how their proposed project will achieve one or more of the following outcomes:

- Environmental impacts of boating on Great Lakes water quality, fish, wildlife, and people are reduced or eliminated.
- Best management practices are adopted in the Great Lakes region to reduce marine-related pollution, protect fish and wildlife populations, preserve and enhance nearshore habitats, and protect human health from the adverse effects of marine-related contaminants.
- Awareness by marina, boatyard, harbor, and port managers is increased regarding the sources and impacts of marine-related pollution to Great Lakes waters.

I.C.5. Areal Extent and Duration of Harmful Algal Blooms. EPA expects to provide up to a total of approximately \$350,000 for approximately one to three projects in amounts up to \$350,000 to assess the areal extent and duration of harmful algal blooms in the Great Lakes from 2008 through 2012. Satellite imagery or other appropriate methodology should be used to conduct assessments for each Great Lake and major sub-basins (e.g., Western Lake Erie, Saginaw Bay, Green Bay). Successful projects will also develop and document Standard Operating Procedures for the continuance of the methods beyond the duration of the project.

The proposed project **must** directly support the GLRI Action Plan Nearshore measure for the extent (square miles) of Great Lakes Harmful Algal Blooms and the GLRI Action Plan objective for the fifth focus area of implementation of a satellite remote sensing program to assess Great Lakes productivity and biological (e.g. algal bloom) events.

Outputs from the projects under this category should include both of the following:

- Development of a Standard Operating Procedure for assessing the extent and duration of harmful Great Lakes algal blooms.
- Compilation of annual estimates, by Great Lake and lake sub-basins, of the extent and duration of harmful algal blooms from 2008 through 2012.

Applicants must also demonstrate how their proposed project will achieve one or more of the following outcomes:

- Methodologies for estimating the severity of harmful algal blooms are consistently applied in order to assess effectiveness of managerial actions for reducing loadings of nutrients and sediments to the Great Lakes.
- The causes of nutrient-related nearshore biological impairments are better understood and the number and severity of incidences of harmful algal blooms are reduced.

I.D. Request for Applications – Accountability, Education, Monitoring, Evaluation, Communication, and Partnership.

General Background. Effective governmental partnerships and informed public participation are important components of a long term Great Lakes protection and restoration strategy to fully implement the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Action Plan.

To address these issues and make progress towards achieving the goals, objectives, and targets identified for this focus area in the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Action Plan, EPA is soliciting applications for projects as described below.

I.D.1. Education and Outreach. EPA expects to provide approximately \$250,000 for approximately two to ten projects ranging in amounts up to \$200,000 to develop education and outreach programs and/or materials, stressing the importance of Great Lakes stewardship.

Projects may include, but are not limited to:

- Great Lakes curriculum development.
- Teacher workshops.

Outputs from the projects under this category should include:

- Increase in the number of educational institutions (particularly those institutions located in underserved communities) incorporating new Great Lakes stewardship materials into their environmental education curricula.

Applicants must also demonstrate how their proposed project will achieve one or more of the following outcomes:

- Understanding of Great Lakes stewardship is improved.
- Great Lakes stewardship practices increase.

I.D.2. Implement Lakewide Management Plan Projects. EPA expects to provide approximately \$2,200,000 for approximately 8 to 15 projects in amounts up to \$300,000 to strategically implement critical Lakewide Management Plan (LaMP) projects not covered by other sections of this RFA. Proposals should focus on implementation of LaMP priorities. For the purpose of this RFA, the term “LaMP” includes Lakewide Management Plans for Lakes Ontario, Michigan, Erie, and Superior, the Lake Huron Binational Partnership Action Plan, and the Comprehensive Management Plan for Lake St. Clair. (See Appendix I for information about LaMP goals and priorities and other projects.)

EPA is especially interested in projects in the following areas:

- Implementation of projects to increase the number and/or diversity of stakeholders participating in LaMP priorities.
- Implementation of public information campaigns to further LaMP protection and restoration goals.
- Implementation of LaMP priorities described in Appendix I.

Outputs from the projects under this category should include one or more of the following:

- Increase in number and/or diversity of stakeholders participating in LaMP priorities.
- Increase in the number of LaMP information campaigns to further LaMP protection and restoration goals.
- Increase in the implementation of priority LaMP projects.

Applicants must also demonstrate how their proposed project will achieve one or more of the following outcomes:

- Better and more diverse input on Great Lakes issues is provided to governmental organizations by Great Lakes stakeholders and citizens.
- Actions by citizens are increased to better protect and restore the Great Lakes ecosystem.
- Projects are implemented that improve water quality and the Great Lakes ecosystem.

II. Award Information

Amounts, Targets, and Number of Projects. Approximately \$40 million is expected to be awarded under this RFA for about 150 projects.⁵ The number of agreements EPA will fund as a result of this RFA will be based on the quality of applications received, the availability of funding, and other applicable considerations. The estimated total award dollar amounts and any estimated individual project minimum or maximum amounts identified in Section I are estimates only and are informational and planning targets provided for application preparation purposes, except that the maximum amount of federal funds that will be awarded for a Watershed Remediation project (Section I.C.3) is \$1,000,000. While applications requesting funding below or above any estimated minimum or maximum individual project amounts identified in Section I for the different project activities will be considered, EPA encourages applicants to submit applications that are not below or do not exceed any such identified minimum or maximum individual project amounts.

The actual award amounts and number of projects awarded under each of the focus areas in Section I may differ from what is estimated for many reasons including the number of meritorious applications received, funding availability, and other applicable considerations. In addition, EPA reserves the right to increase or decrease (including to zero) the total number and amount of awards under each focus area (and category under a focus area), or change the ratio of assistance agreements it awards among the focus areas (and categories under the focus areas). Such changes may be necessary because of the quality of applications received by EPA in each focus area (and category), the amount of funds awarded to the selected applicants, funding availability, or other applicable considerations.

⁵ If an applicant submits multiple projects that are selected for award, if appropriate and feasible, one award may cover more than one project.

EPA reserves the right to reject all applications and make no awards under any or all categories of activities in this RFA or make fewer awards than anticipated.

Anticipated Project Start and End Dates. EPA anticipates that applicants will submit certifications and other documentation required for a full and complete funding package so that their projects could, if selected, start by July or August of 2011. Project periods are expected to be appropriate to the proposed work and are generally expected to range from one to three years. Project periods must not exceed five years.

Awards from additional funding. EPA reserves the right to make additional awards under this RFA, consistent with Agency policy and guidance, if additional funding becomes available after (or at the time) original selections are made. Any additional selections for awards will be made no later than six months after the original selection decisions.

Funding Type. Successful applicants will be issued a grant or cooperative agreement as appropriate. A cooperative agreement is an assistance agreement that is used when there is substantial federal involvement with the recipient during the performance of an activity or project. EPA awards cooperative agreements for those projects in which it expects to have substantial interaction with the recipient throughout the performance of the project. EPA will negotiate the precise terms and conditions of “substantial involvement” as part of the award process. Federal involvement may include close monitoring of the recipient’s performance; collaboration during the performance of the scope of work; in accordance with 40 CFR 30.44(e) and 31.36(g), review of proposed procurements; reviewing qualifications of key personnel; and/or review and comment on the content of printed or electronic publications prepared. EPA does not have the authority to select employees or contractors employed by the recipient. The final decision on the content of reports rests with the recipient.

Future Funding. Selection or award of funding under this RFA is not a guarantee of future funding.

Partial Funding. In appropriate circumstances, EPA reserves the right to partially fund applications by funding discrete portions or phases of proposed projects. If EPA decides to partially fund an application, it will do so in a manner that does not prejudice any applicants or affect the basis upon which the application was evaluated and selected for award, and, therefore, maintains the integrity of the competition and selection process.

III. Eligibility Information

Applicant Eligibility (CFDA 66.469). Governmental entities, including State pollution control agencies, interstate agencies, Tribes, local governments as defined in 40 CFR 31.3, institutions of higher learning (e.g., colleges and universities that are subject to 40 CFR Part 30 or 40 CFR Part 31), and non-profit organizations are eligible to apply for funding under this RFA; individuals, foreign organizations and governments, nonprofit organizations exempt from taxation under section 501 (c) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code that lobby, and “for-profit” organizations are not eligible. Non-profit organization, as defined by OMB Circular A-122, located at 2 CFR Part 230, means any corporation, trust, association, cooperative, or other organization which: (1) is operated primarily for scientific, educational, service, charitable, or similar purposes in the public interest; (2) is not organized primarily for profit; and (3) uses its net proceeds to maintain, improve, and/or expand its operations.

Coalitions. Groups of two or more eligible applicants may choose to form a coalition and submit a single application under this RFA; however, one entity must be responsible for the grant. Coalitions must identify which eligible organization will be the recipient of the grant and which eligible organization(s) will be subawardees of the recipient. Subawards and subgrants must be consistent with the definition of that term in 40 CFR §30.2(ff) and §31.3. The recipient must administer the grant, will be accountable to the EPA for proper expenditure of the funds and reporting, and will be the point of contact for the coalition. As provided in 40 CFR §30.2(gg) and 40 CFR §31.3, subrecipients or subgrantees are accountable to the recipient or grantee for proper use of EPA funding.

Coalitions may not include for-profit organizations that will provide services or products to the successful applicant. For-profit organizations are not eligible for subawards. For-profit organizations are eligible to receive contracts. Any contracts for services or products funded with EPA financial assistance must be awarded under the competitive procurement procedures of 40 CFR Parts 30 and 31. The regulations also contain limitations on consultant compensation. Please see EPA’s narrow definition of consultants in the Sections 40 CFR §30.27(b) or 40 CFR §31.36(j), as applicable. For additional information, please review the following Federal Register <http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2004/pdf/04-7867.pdf>.

Eligible Activities. Under this RFA, assistance is available to eligible applicants for planning, research, monitoring, outreach, and implementation in furtherance of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. To be eligible for funding, proposed activities must protect, enhance and/or restore the Great Lakes, including projects impacting connecting waterways such as Lake St. Clair and the St. Lawrence River at or upstream from the point at which the St. Lawrence River becomes the international boundary between Canada and the United States. Information about the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/glri>. Applications for other activities will be rejected.

Ineligible Activities. Applications which include any of these ineligible activities may be rejected depending on the extent to which they contain the ineligible activities:

- Traditional water or wastewater infrastructure projects (other than “green infrastructure”⁶ projects that improve habitat and other ecosystem functions in the Great Lakes) which are eligible for funding from:
 - a State water pollution control revolving fund established under title VI of the Clean Water Act; or
 - a State drinking water revolving loan fund established under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12).
- Any activities/projects that are specifically required by a draft or final NPDES permit or by a consent decree.
- Basic research, meaning research for the purpose of expanding knowledge or general understanding. This differs from applied research for the purpose of implementing solutions for practical problems. If a practical use is only a few years away, then the activity will be deemed to be applied research; however, if a practical use is reasonably expected to be 10 or more years away, then the activity will be deemed to be basic research.
- Monitoring activities under Section I.C.3.
- Land acquisition other than acquisition of easements.
- Removal or remediation of contaminated sediments.
- Projects the principal purpose for which is general operating support.
- Projects which EPA determines will be funded by EPA through a non-competitive state or tribal grant.

In addition, the respective categories in Section I of the RFA describe certain activities which are ineligible activities for those categories (but may be eligible elsewhere). Such categories and ineligible activities include:

- Delist Areas of Concern/Beneficial Use Impairments (Section I.A.1) – Applications for which the principal purposes are removal of Habitat BUIs or for TMDL implementation are ineligible for this category.
- Pollution Prevention and Toxics Reduction (Section I.A.2) - Actions to remove/remediate soil, debris, or other materials or to control erosion are ineligible for this category.

⁶ Green Infrastructure includes a wide array of practices at multiple scales that manage and treat stormwater and that maintain and restore natural hydrology by infiltrating, evapotranspiring and capturing and using stormwater. On a regional scale, green infrastructure is the preservation and restoration of natural landscape features, such as forests, floodplains and wetlands, coupled with policies such as infill and redevelopment that reduce overall imperviousness in a watershed. On the local scale, green infrastructure consists of site- and neighborhood-specific practices, such as bioretention, trees, green roofs, porous pavements and cisterns.

Match or Cost-Share. There is no cost-sharing or matching requirement as a condition of eligibility under this competition. However, see Section IV.C.2.c and Section V for additional information on applicants proposing voluntary matches and additional funds/resources to support the project.

Threshold Eligibility Criteria. These are requirements that, if not met by the Applicant by the application submission deadline specified in Section IV, will result in elimination of the application from consideration for funding. Only applications for eligible activities from eligible entities (see above) that meet these criteria will be evaluated against the ranking factors in Section V of this RFA. Applicants deemed ineligible for funding consideration as a result of the threshold eligibility review will be notified within 15 calendar days of the ineligibility determination.

1.
 - a. Applications must substantially comply with the application submission instructions and requirements set forth in Section IV of this RFA or else they will be rejected. However, where a page limit is stated for the Narrative Proposal in Section IV, pages in excess of the limitation will not be reviewed.
 - b. Applications must be submitted to EPA or through <http://www.grants.gov> by the submission deadline identified in Section IV. Applicants are responsible for ensuring that their applications are submitted by the submission deadline. Neither zipped file submissions nor faxed submissions will be accepted.
 - c. An application submitted to EPA or through grants.gov after the deadline will be considered late and rejected without further consideration unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate that it was late due to EPA mishandling or because of technical problems solely attributable to the submittal Website (linked to from www.epa.gov/greatlakes/fund/2011rfa01/ or <http://www.grants.gov>) and not the applicant.
2. Applications must be for eligible activities as described above under the section “Eligible Activities” and which support (i) the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Action Plan http://greatlakesrestoration.us/action/wp-content/uploads/glri_actionplan.pdf and/or (ii) Sub-objective 4.3.3 (Improve the Health of Great Lakes ecosystems) of EPA’s Strategic Plan <http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/plan.htm>.
3. Applicants may submit more than one application under this RFA so long as each one is for a different project and is separately submitted.
4. Each application must address one, and only one, focus area, and one, and only one, category under a focus area, as described in Section I of the RFA. Applications must also meet any additional eligibility requirements described in Section I that apply to the respective category. Such additional eligibility requirements are specifically described and included in:
 - Delist Areas of Concern/Beneficial Use Impairments (Section I.A.1) – Removal of one or more of 12 applicable BUIs AND letter of support from applicable State agency or explanation.

- Pollution Prevention and Toxics Reduction (Section I.A.2) – Targeting of applicable substances.
- Watershed Remediation (Section I.C.3) – \$1,000,000 maximum federal amount; implementation of applicable practices and measures; identification of applicable components; and estimation of applicable results.
- Areal Extent and Duration of Harmful Algal Blooms (Section I.C.5) – direct support of applicable Action Plan measure and objective.

Applicants should contact the applicable individuals listed in Section VII of this RFA with any questions about the threshold eligibility requirements that may apply to a particular category

IV. Application and Submission Information

A. How to Obtain an Application Package

Applicants can download individual grant application forms from EPA's Office of Grants and Debarment website at: <http://www.epa.gov/ogd/AppKit/application.htm> .

B. Mode of Application Submission

Applicants have the following options to submit their applications: 1) through the submittal link on: <http://epa.gov/greatlakes/fund/2011rfa01>, or 2) electronically through <http://www.grants.gov> by your organization's authorized official representative as explained in Appendix II. All applications must be prepared, and include the information, as described below in Section IV.C "Content of Application," regardless of mode of transmission. Applicants may be required to follow up electronic submissions with paper copies subsequent to the submission due date. Applicants who are not able to submit applications via the Internet methods described above should contact Lawrence Brail (312-886-7474 / brail.lawrence@epa.gov) for alternative submission instructions. Regardless of the mode of submission, applications must meet the submission requirements specified below and be received by the submission deadline.

C. Content of Application Package Submission

All application submissions, regardless of mode of submission, must contain completed and signed grant application forms, as well as a Narrative Proposal, as described below.

Grant Application Forms. Please be sure to include the organization fax number and email address in Block 5 of the Standard Form SF 424. The forms are available at <http://www.epa.gov/ogd/AppKit/application.htm>.

- ☐ Standard Form 424, *Application for Federal Assistance*
- ☐ Standard Form 424A, *Budget Information – Non-Construction Programs*
- ☐ Standard Form 424B, *Assurances for Non-Construction Programs*
- ☐ Standard Form 6600-06, *Certification Regarding Lobbying*
- ☐ EPA Form 5700-54, *Key Contacts Form*
- ☐ EPA Form 4700-4, *Pre-Award Compliance Review Report for All Applicants Requesting*

Federal Financial Assistance

- ☐ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL), if applicable
- ☐ Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement.
- ☐ Narrative Proposal (as described below)
- ☐ Other Attachments (as described below)

Narrative Proposal. Narrative Proposals (**sections 1-3 below, which include the Summary Information Page, Workplan, and Detailed Budget Narrative**) must be no more than twenty single-spaced pages in length and should include the items below in the requested order; excess pages will not be reviewed. Each Narrative Proposal must be formatted for 8½” x 11” paper and should use no smaller than an 11-point Times New Roman font with 1” margins as a single Microsoft Word, WordPerfect or Adobe Acrobat file. If you submit an Adobe Acrobat file, it must be generated by printing the document to the Acrobat Distiller, PDF Writer, or similar software, and NOT scanned in from a hard-copy (i.e., don’t send us a “picture” of your application). Do not include more than one application in any file. Please do not zip the file or use a zip extension for your file, because we will not be able to open it.

It is recommended that confidential business information not be included in your application.

1. Summary Information Page (it should not exceed one page):

- a. **Funding Opportunity Number, Focus Area, and Category.** The RFA number is EPA-R5-GL2011-1. Identify the focus area from Section I to which the proposal relates (choose one from among “Toxic Substances and Areas of Concern,” “Invasive Species,” “Nearshore Health and Nonpoint Source Pollution,” and “Accountability, Education, Monitoring, Evaluation, Communication, and Partnerships”). For Category, identify the category listed under a focus area to which the proposal relates. Identify only one focus area and category per proposal submission.
- b. **Project Title.** Please limit to 60 characters, or EPA reserves the right to change the project title for its administrative convenience. Applicants who are submitting separate, complementary proposals may wish to use a proposal title with the same first words followed by a hyphen and a unique project title.
- c. **Applicant Information.** Include applicant (organization) name, address, contact person, phone number, fax, e-mail address, Congressional District, and DUNS number (see Section VI.D). *Do not include private information.*
- d. **Type of Organization.** Choose from:
 - a. Local Government (includes County, Municipal, Intermunicipal organizations, Township, Special Purpose District and other entities identified as local governments at 40 CFR 31.3)
 - b. State Agency (includes Interstate)
 - c. Tribal Organization
 - d. College and University (includes private and state institutions)

- e. Not for Profit
 - f. Other
- e. **Proposed Funding Request.** The total dollar amount requested from EPA.
- f. **Project Period.** Provide beginning and ending dates. (Except as specifically provided in Section I of the RFA, projects are anticipated to begin no earlier than July 1, 2011 and end no later than September 30, 2014.)
- g. **Brief Project Description.** Summarize the proposed project in a clear and succinct manner, including expected outputs, outcomes and environmental benefits resulting from implementation of the project. Include environmental KEY TERMS that could be used as search terms (e.g., water quality, toxins, mercury, etc.). Do not use acronyms. Should the proposal be selected and a grant awarded, this description may be posted to the EPA Web, which has a 595 character limit, including spaces, to this field; EPA reserves the right to make unilateral changes to conform to posting requirements. See https://restore.glnpo.net/glas_pub/qareport.htm for examples.
- h. **Project Location.** Specify the project location, if applicable, including 8- or 12-digit HUC code; latitude and longitude; and State, Congressional District, county, city, and 5 digit ZIP Code.

2. Work Plan. The Work Plan for each proposed project must explicitly describe how the proposed project meets the guidelines established in Sections I-III of this announcement (including the threshold eligibility criteria in Section III.C) and must address each of the evaluation criteria set forth in Section V.

- A. Project Summary and Approach.** Describe with specificity the nature of the proposed project including what will be done, by whom, how, and when. Outline the steps to be taken and the significant milestones to be achieved to complete the proposed project as well as the estimated schedule of these achievements, including submittal of the final report, with dates. Include a statement of the project's relevance to the Great Lakes, particularly (i) the needs and priorities of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Action Plan (http://greatlakesrestoration.us/action/wp-content/uploads/glri_actionplan.pdf), (ii) Great Lakes protection and restoration pursuant to Sub-objective 4.3.3 (Improve the Health of Great Lakes ecosystems) of EPA's Strategic Plan <http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/plan.htm>. (It is sufficient for the purpose of clause (ii) to include a general statement of how the project will protect and restore the Great Lakes ecosystem without specifying a connection to the Great Lakes Index or remediation of contaminated sediments.) **If your proposed project is for a category that requires specific information described in Section I, include that information in this section.**
- B. Results – Outputs and Outcomes:** Specify the quantitative and qualitative expected outputs and outcomes of the proposed project, including those identified in Section I for

the different activity categories and any other applicable objectives or measures from the GLRI Action Plan and what measurements will be used to track and measure your progress towards achieving the applicable outputs and outcomes. Specify the estimated quantifiable environmental and economic outputs, outcomes, and results of the proposed project, including affected pollutants, industry sectors, economic impacts, habitats, and/or species. Include an estimate of the amount of chemicals to be collected or prevented, acres protected or restored, etc. Describe the anticipated accuracy of that estimate, including applicable limitations.

- C. Collaboration, Partnerships, and Overarching Plans:** Describe your approach for promoting and/or obtaining collaboration and support from the public, private, and independent sectors in performing the project in order to expand its impact, and also describe whether and how your project complements other projects or activities being performed to achieve a larger beneficial impact from your project. List the proposed groups that will be involved in the project and any related projects and studies, and what each of the groups' roles will be in the project staffing, funding, design and implementation. Describe the type of collaboration/support proposed, how you will ensure that it will materialize during grant performance, and what role it will play in the overall project. Describe how you will coordinate activities of the project with related or complementary projects and studies. PLEASE CAREFULLY REVIEW SECTION IV. H. (Questions and Answers Pertaining to Contracts and Subawards) IF YOU INTEND TO PROVIDE EPA FUNDS TO ANY COLLABORATING ORGANIZATION.

If the project is part of any applicable overarching plan for protection and restoration of an important Great Lakes place-based effort, including LaMPs, RAPs, State Great Lakes plans, TMDLs and watershed management plans, describe the purpose and effect of the project in such plan. (Such plans may cross over one or more focus areas and categories of activities. See Appendix I for a statement of LaMP priorities, which may be applicable to each of the respective focus areas and activity categories.) Provide an active Internet link (URL) for that overarching plan or, if a URL is not available, attach the plan as part of item 4.e below. A cover letter which provides this information may constitute such an overarching plan. For Nearshore and Nonpoint Source Pollution projects which are part of an overarching, comprehensive plan, describe the targeted restoration potential, including the extent to which: identifiable impairments have been identified and the causes for those impairments have been clearly established; solutions to remediation of the impairments have been identified; broadly supported implementation activities have been designed; and there is potential for significant measurable results.

In addition, for projects submitted under the Category I.C.3 (Watersheds Best Management Practices Implementation), applicants may propose a voluntary cost-match to provide additional support for the project and this may specifically be considered during the selection process for these projects as described in Section V. Applicants proposing a voluntary match for these projects should describe the voluntary match, how they will ensure it is provided during grant performance, and what role it will play in the overall project. If EPA accepts an offer for a voluntary cost-match, applicants must meet

the matching commitment as a condition of receiving EPA funding. The recipient is legally-obligated to meet any proposed voluntary cost-match that is included in the approved project budget because the grant agreement includes the voluntary cost-match. Applicants may use their own funds or other resources for a voluntary cost-match if the standards at 40 CFR 30.23 or 40 CFR 31.24, as applicable, are met. Only eligible and allowable costs may be used for voluntary cost-match. Other Federal grants may not be used as voluntary cost-matches without specific statutory authority (e.g. HUD's Community Development Block Grants).

For projects submitted under the other activity categories identified in this RFA, if the applicant is proposing to provide a voluntary cost-match or other form of additional funds/resources to demonstrate support for the project, they should describe that in this section of the proposal. They should also describe how they will ensure that the voluntary cost-match or other funds/resources will be provided during grant performance, and what role they will play in the overall project. Any additional funds/resources, including voluntary matches and their source, must be identified in the application and, if applicable, on appropriate grant application forms. The additional funds or other resources need not be for eligible and allowable project costs under the EPA assistance agreement unless the Applicant proposes to provide a voluntary cost-match. If EPA accepts an offer for a voluntary cost-match, applicants must meet their sharing commitment as a condition of receiving EPA funding. The recipient is legally-obligated to meet any proposed voluntary cost-match that is included in the approved project budget because the grant agreement includes the voluntary cost-match. Applicants may use their own funds or other resources for a voluntary cost-match if the standards at 40 CFR 30.23 or 40 CFR 31.24, as applicable, are met. Only eligible and allowable costs may be used for voluntary cost-matches. Other federal grants may not be used as voluntary cost-matches without specific statutory authority (e.g. HUD's Community Development Block Grants).

Any voluntary cost-match should also be identified below in the Budget section (E). If subawards or subcontracts are involved, please also refer to the discussion of those topics in Section IV.H below.

- D. Community-Based Focus.** Demonstrate how the proposed project will address the needs and concerns of local communities and other interested parties, groups, or populations that are affected by the environmental and/or other issues that the project is intended to address. Demonstrate how the applicant will engage and work with community-based organizations (as defined in this RFA) and other appropriate parties to enhance project effectiveness and/or efficiency including the applicant's plans for making subawards, as necessary and appropriate (see Section IV.H), to community-based organizations to enhance project effectiveness and/or efficiency. Applicants, not EPA, will select their subawardees and the Applicant must demonstrate in its proposal that the community-based organization(s) are willing to accept the subaward and have the capacity to effectively administer and perform the agreement. Selected applicants who propose to make subawards, including those to community-based groups, must follow

proper procedures in making subawards and will be expected to make the subawards consistent with their application. The award will include a term and condition requiring the applicant to make the subawards consistent with their application.

- E. Programmatic Capability and Past Performance:** Submit a list of federally funded assistance agreements (assistance agreements include grants and cooperative agreements but not federal contracts) similar in size, scope and relevance to the proposed project that your organization performed within the last three years (no more than 5 agreements, and preferably EPA agreements) and describe (i) whether, and how, you were able to successfully complete and manage those agreements, (ii) your history of meeting the reporting requirements under those agreements including whether you adequately and timely reported on your progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes of those agreements (and if not, explain why not) and whether you submitted acceptable final technical reports under the agreements. In evaluating applicants under these factors in Section V, EPA will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources, including information from EPA files and from current and prior Federal agency grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant). If you received a GLRI award in 2010, that should be one of the agreements you list. If you do not have any relevant or available past performance or reporting information, please indicate this in the proposal and you will receive a neutral score for these factors (a neutral score is half of the total points available in a subset of possible points). Failure to indicate this may result in 0 points for these factors.

In addition, provide information on your organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed projects, and your staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed projects.

- F. Job Creation.** Describe how the project is expected to promote and/or facilitate job creation through implementation of environmental restoration projects and other activities which further protection of the environment of the Great Lakes responsive to the application review criteria in Section V.F.

- G. Environmental Justice.** Describe how the project promotes environmental justice responsive to the application review criteria in Section V.G.

3. Detailed Budget Narrative. (Also see Appendix III, Budget Sample). Clearly explain how EPA funds will be used. Use this section to provide a narrative description of the budget found in the SF-424A. Applicants must itemize costs related to personnel, fringe benefits, contractual costs, travel, equipment, supplies, other direct costs, indirect costs, and total costs. Applicants should use whole dollar amounts.

Management Fees: When formulating budgets for applications, applicants must not include management fees or similar charges in excess of the direct costs and indirect costs at the rate approved by the applicant's cognizant audit agency, or at the rate provided for by the terms of the agreement negotiated with EPA. The term "management fees or similar charges" refers to expenses added to the direct costs in order to accumulate and reserve funds for ongoing business expenses, unforeseen liabilities, or for other similar costs that are not allowable under EPA assistance agreements. Management fees or similar charges may not be used to improve or expand the project funded under this agreement, except to the extent authorized as a direct cost of carrying out the scope of work.

Other Attachments. The following attachments are not part of the Narrative Proposal and are not included in the 20 page limit; they may, as appropriate, be considered during evaluations. For additional information about each of these attachments, see the descriptions contained in Appendix II.

- a. Resumes or curriculum vitae of Principal Investigators and critical staff.
- c. Letters of support.
- d. Meetings/Conferences/Workshops.
- e. Overarching plan for which there is no Internet link (URL) - see item 2.C above.
- f. Any applicable scientific peer review of the project which has already been completed.
- g. Applicable maps or charts.

C. Submission. Eligible applicants must submit applications through either www.epa.gov/greatlakes/fund/2011rfa01/ or <http://www.grants.gov>, pages which will be accessible from <http://www.greatlakesrestoration.us>. Applicants who are not able to submit their applications electronically should request information on alternate means of submission by March 25, 2011 to:

U.S. EPA - GLNPO (G-17J)
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590
Attention: Lawrence Brail (312-886-7474 / brail.lawrence@epa.gov)

D. Submission Deadline. Applications, regardless of the mode of submission, **must be submitted to EPA or through grants.gov by noon, Central Standard Time, April 11, 2011.** Applications which are submitted to EPA or through grants.gov after this date and time will not be considered.

E. Notification: EPA expects to confirm application receipt within two weeks of the due date for all submissions. Shortly after the deadline, we will post a link to project information (including Title and identification number) to: <http://epa.gov/greatlakes/fund/2011rfa01>. ALL APPLICANTS SHOULD CHECK THIS POSTING TO VERIFY THAT THEIR SUBMISSIONS HAVE BEEN INCLUDED IN EPA'S DATABASE. See Section VII for contact information if you do not receive a confirmation or if your project is not posted. All Applicants will be contacted following selections to tell them whether or not they have been selected. Selection information will also be posted to a page linked to: <http://epa.gov/greatlakes/fund/2011rfa01>

F. Confidentiality. In accordance with 40 CFR 2.203, applicants may claim all or a portion of their application as confidential business information. EPA will evaluate confidentiality claims in accordance with 40 CFR Part 2. Applicants must clearly mark applications or portions of applications they claim as confidential. If no claim of confidentiality is made, EPA is not required to make the inquiry to the applicant otherwise required by 40 CFR 2.204(c)(2) prior to disclosure. However, the agency considers competitive applications confidential and protected from disclosure prior to the completion of the competitive selection process.

Applicants should be aware that under Public Law No. 105-277, data produced under an award is subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

G. Communications with Applicants. In accordance with EPA's Assistance Agreement Competition Policy (EPA Order 5700.5A1), EPA staff will not meet with individual applicants to discuss draft applications, provide informal comments on draft applications, or provide advice to applicants on how to respond to ranking criteria. Applicants are responsible for the contents of their applications.

EPA will respond to questions in writing from individual applicants regarding threshold eligibility criteria, administrative issues related to the submission of the application, and requests for clarification about the RFA. Submit questions using the form available from: <http://epa.gov/greatlakes/fund/2011rfa01>. EPA will respond to questions received through March 25, 2011, but cannot guarantee that it will respond to questions received thereafter.

EPA will also host two Webinars during which EPA will discuss this RFA and respond to questions. Since all questions may not be able to be asked and answered during the scheduled times for the call, questions should be submitted in advance using the form mentioned above. The Webinars will be broadcast live and will be archived for future playback. Pre-registration will be required for the Webinars.

Webinar Schedule

Dates: March 9, 2011 and March 17, 2011

Time: 10:00 AM CST

Topic: EPA Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Request for Applications

Further details, including a link for the Webinar, will be available from:

<http://epa.gov/greatlakes/fund/2011rfa01>

If you register at <http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/maillist> we will send you any updates to GLNPO funding information.

H. Questions and Answers Pertaining to Contracts and Subawards:

1. Can funding be used for the applicant to make subawards, acquire contract services, or fund partnerships?

EPA awards funds to one eligible applicant as the recipient even if other eligible applicants are named as partners or co-applicants or members of a coalition or consortium. The recipient is accountable to EPA for the proper expenditure of funds.

Funding may be used to provide subgrants or subawards of financial assistance, which includes using subawards or subgrants to fund partnerships, provided the recipient complies with applicable requirements for subawards or subgrants including those contained in 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31, as appropriate. Applicants must compete contracts for services and products, including consultant contracts, and conduct cost and price analyses, to the extent required by the procurement provisions of the regulations at 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31, as appropriate. The regulations also contain limitations on consultant compensation. Applicants are not required to identify subawardees/subgrantees and/or contractors (including consultants) in their application. However, if they do, the fact that an applicant selected for award has named a specific subawardee/subgrantee, contractor, or consultant in the application EPA selects for funding does not relieve the applicant of its obligations to comply with subaward/subgrant and/or competitive procurement requirements as appropriate. Please note that applicants may not award sole source contracts to consulting, engineering or other firms assisting applicants with the application solely based on the firm's role in preparing the application.

Successful applicants cannot use subgrants or subawards to avoid requirements in EPA grant regulations for competitive procurement by using these instruments to acquire commercial services or products from for-profit organizations to carry out its assistance agreement. The nature of the transaction between the recipient and the subawardee or subgrantee must be consistent with the standards for distinguishing between vendor transactions and subrecipient assistance under Subpart B Section 210 of OMB Circular A-133, and the definitions of subaward at 40 CFR 30.2(ff) or subgrant at 40 CFR 31.3, as applicable. EPA will not be a party to these transactions. Applicants acquiring commercial goods or services must comply with the competitive procurement standards in 40 CFR Part 30 or 40 CFR Part 31.36 and cannot use a subaward/subgrant as the funding mechanism.

2. How will an applicant's proposed subawardees/subgrantees and contractors be considered during the evaluation process described in Section V of the RFA?

Section V of the RFA describes the evaluation criteria and evaluation process that will be used by EPA to make selections under this RFA. During this evaluation, except for those criteria that relate to the applicant's own qualifications, past performance, and reporting history, the review panel will consider, as appropriate and relevant, the qualifications, expertise, and experience of:

- (i) an applicant's named subawardees/subgrantees identified in the application if the applicant demonstrates in the application that if it receives an award that the subaward/subgrant will be properly awarded consistent with the applicable regulations in 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31. For example, applicants must not use subawards/subgrants to obtain commercial services or products from for profit firms or individual consultants.
- (ii) an applicant's named contractors, including consultants, identified in the application if the applicant demonstrates in its application that the contractors was selected in

compliance with the competitive Procurement Standards in 40 CFR Part 30 or 40 CFR 31.36 as appropriate. For example, an applicant must demonstrate that it selected the contractors competitively or that a proper non-competitive sole-source award consistent with the regulations will be made to the contractors, that efforts were made to provide small and disadvantaged businesses with opportunities to compete, and that some form of cost or price analysis was conducted. EPA may not accept sole source justifications for contracts for services or products that are otherwise readily available in the commercial marketplace.

EPA will not consider the qualifications, experience, and expertise of named subawardees/ subgrantees and/or named contractors during the application evaluation process unless the applicant complies with these requirements.

I. Intergovernmental Review. Executive Order 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs, may be applicable to awards resulting from this announcement. Applicants selected for funding may be required to provide a copy of their application to their State Point of Contact (SPOC) for review, pursuant to Executive Order 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs. This review is not required before submitting an application and not all states require such a review. A listing of State Point of Contacts (SPOC) may be viewed at: www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants/spoc.html

V. Application Review

Applications meeting the threshold eligibility criteria in Section III will be evaluated based on the Criteria set forth below. Applicants should directly and explicitly address these criteria as part of their Narrative Proposal and application submission. Each submittal will be rated under a point system, with a total of 100 points possible. Applicants will be evaluated based on the quality and extent to which they address the criteria; the failure to provide applicable information in the application may affect the score assigned for a criterion.

A. Project Summary and Approach - 20 points. Applicants will be evaluated based on their strategic approach for performing the project including the soundness and logic of their technical approach. Results of any applicable scientific peer review submitted by the applicant may be considered as a part of the evaluation under this criterion.

Applicants may score higher on this criterion to the extent they demonstrate in their Narrative Proposal one or more of the following elements:

- A clear connection, rather than a weak connection, to protection and restoration of the Great Lakes themselves;
- Immediacy and timeliness in project implementation (“shovel ready”) and in attaining proposed and expected outputs and outcomes including protection, enhancement and restoration;

- Protection or restoration potential as part of an overarching, comprehensive plan (including Lakewide Management Plans, Remedial Action Plans, State Great Lakes plans, watershed plans (including those which impact Areas of Concern)), and other place-based plans including TMDLs;

In considering the protection or restoration potential (the third bullet above) of an application for any Nearshore and Nonpoint Source Pollution project under Section I.C of this RFA which is part of an overarching, comprehensive plan, the project may receive a higher score to the extent that: identifiable impairments have been identified and the causes for those impairments have been clearly established; solutions to remediation of the impairments have been identified; broadly supported implementation activities have been designed; and there is potential for significant measurable results.

B. Outputs and Outcomes – 20 points.

(i) Applicants will be evaluated based on their approach for demonstrating how they will achieve the expected and proposed project outputs and outcomes applicable to the focus area and category to which the application relates including those identified in Section I for the applicable program category. **(15 points)**

(ii) Applicants will be evaluated based on their plan and approach for measuring and tracking their progress towards achieving the expected and proposed project outputs and outcomes including those identified in Section I that apply to the applicable category to which the application relates. **(5 points)**

C. Collaboration, Partnerships, and Overarching Plans (see Section IV.C.2.c) – 10 points.

Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent to which they demonstrate that they will work in partnership with appropriate partners (such as governmental agencies--including applicable regulatory entities--, community groups, community-based organizations, businesses, stakeholders, States, Cities, and Counties) to effectively and efficiently implement the proposed project and whether their project is coordinated with and/or complements other projects or activities being performed to produce a greater positive environmental impact from their project. This includes evaluating the Applicant's plans for obtaining collaboration and support from the public, private, and independent sectors in performing the project in order to expand its impact, the scope of the partnership (including the diversity and number of partners), type of collaboration proposed, the likelihood that it will materialize during grant performance, and what role it will play in the overall project. For example, a collaboration or partnership to be effected by a grant to a single entity who would then make sub-awards, as appropriate, to identified governmental or non profit sub-recipients to implement an over-arching plan would be considered under this criterion.

D. Community-based Focus: - 10 points. Under this criterion applicants will be evaluated based on the quality and extent to which their proposal demonstrates how the proposed project will address the needs and concerns of local communities and other interested parties, groups, or populations that are affected by the environmental and/or other issues

that the project is intended to address. This includes evaluating the quality and extent to which the applicant demonstrates how it will engage and work with community-based organizations (as defined in this RFA) and other appropriate parties to enhance the effectiveness and/or efficiency of the project and the applicant's plans for making subawards, as necessary and appropriate (see Section IV.H), to incorporated community-based organizations to enhance project effectiveness and/or efficiency. Applicants, not EPA, will select their subawardees and the Applicant must demonstrate in its proposal that the community-based organization(s) are willing to accept the subaward and have the capacity to effectively administer and perform the agreement. Selected applicants who propose to make subawards, including those to community-based organizations, must follow proper procedures in making subawards and will be expected to make the subawards consistent with their proposal. The award will include a term and condition requiring the applicant to make the subawards consistent with their proposal.

- E. Programmatic Capability and Past Performance – 15 points.** Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project taking into account their: (i) past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV.B of the RFA (**3 points**), (ii) history of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV.B of the RFA including whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements and the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not (**3 points**), (iii) organizational experience and plan for timely and successfully achieving project objectives (**3 points**), and (iv) staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain qualified staff and resources on a timely basis, to successfully achieve project goals (**6 points**). Note: In evaluating applicants under items (i) and (ii) of this criterion, the Agency will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources including agency files and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information supplied by the applicant). If you do not have any relevant or available past performance or reporting information, please indicate this in the Narrative Proposal and you will receive a neutral score for these subfactors (a neutral score is one half of the points available for the item). If you do not provide any response for these items, you may receive a score of 0 for these factors.

NOTE: For projects involving use or collection of environmental data, the applicant's timely compliance with current American National Standard Specifications and Guidelines for Quality Systems for Environmental Data Collection and Environmental Technology Programs, ANSI/ASQC E4-1994 may also be considered.

- F. Job Creation – 5 points.** Applications will be evaluated based on the extent to which the applicant can demonstrate how the proposed project will effectively facilitate and/or promote job creation as part of effective and efficient project implementation. The

application may receive a higher score under this criterion to the extent the applicant can sufficiently and credibly demonstrate the potential for the project to create numerous permanent jobs, including jobs created on a civilian conservation corps model for environmental restoration projects.

G. Environmental Justice – 5 points. Applications will be evaluated based on the extent to which the applicant can demonstrate how the proposed project will effectively address adverse environmental impacts that disproportionately affect communities. Factors indicating disproportionate impacts include: differential proximity and exposure to environmental hazards; greater susceptibility to adverse effects from environmental hazards (due to causes such as genetic predisposition, age, chronic medical conditions, lack of health care access, or poor nutrition); unique environmental exposures because of practices linked to cultural background or socioeconomic status (for example, subsistence fishing or farming); cumulative effects from multiple stressors; reduced ability to effectively participate in decision-making processes (due to causes such as language barriers, inability to access traditional communication channels, or limited capacity to access technical and legal resources); and degraded physical infrastructure, such as poor housing, poorly maintained public buildings (e.g., schools), or lack of access to transportation.

H. Budget – 15 points. Applications will be evaluated based on the reasonableness, efficiency, and appropriateness of the proposed budget for the level of work proposed and for the expected benefits to be achieved.

An applicant's budget and budget narrative must account for both federal funds and any non-federal funds (e.g., any voluntary cost share/match if applicable). Applicants must precisely describe in their budget narrative how they will account for any voluntary cost share/match or other non-EPA funds and what role EPA funding will play in the overall project.

Review and Selection Process. Applications will first be evaluated against the threshold factors listed in Section III. Only those applications which meet all of the threshold factors will be evaluated using the evaluation criteria listed above. Eligible applications will be evaluated, based on the criteria above, by review panels composed of Federal agency staff. There will be separate review panels for evaluating eligible applications submitted under each category described in Section I. Review panels will rank the applications based on the criteria above and provide preliminary funding recommendations to management. Information pertaining to proposed recommendations may be shared with appropriate governmental organizations before selections are made in order to determine whether potential selections (i) are expected to be funded by another funding agency under the Initiative or any other known funding source or (ii) could be affected by permitting or regulatory issues.

In reviewing applications submitted for projects under the Category I.C.3 (Watersheds Best Management Practices, Planning, and Implementation), the review panel will also consider any voluntary cost-match proposed by the applicant in terms of what the overall project will

achieve (see Section IV.C.2.c) and provide its assessment of the proposed voluntary cost-match to the Selection Official described below who may consider it in making final selections for projects under this category.

Final funding decisions will be made by the Selection Official(s). In making the final funding decisions, the Selection Official(s) will consider the review panel rankings and recommendations and may also consider any duplicate funding issues or permitting or regulatory issues as discussed above; program priorities; funding availability; appropriate balances of geographic and jurisdictional distribution of projects (e.g., appropriate geographic distribution can include balancing projects among LAMPs to address each of their priorities); and organizational diversity in terms of applicant type selected to receive awards (e.g., local government, State Agency, Tribal Organization, College and University, and other Not for Profit) in order to help ensure a broad representation of entity types receiving awards to promote program effectiveness. For projects submitted under the Category I.C.3 – Watersheds Best Management Practices, Planning, and Implementation – the Selection Official(s) may also consider the review panel’s assessment of any proposed voluntary cost-match as discussed above. Any final selections made out of rank order from the review panel rankings will be documented and must be justified based on the factors listed above. Once selections have been made, a funding recommendation will be developed and forwarded to the EPA Award Official.

Conflict of Interest: All reviewers will be required to sign a disclosure of conflict of interest statement and will be removed from the review of applications where an actual or potential conflict of interest (that cannot be mitigated) exists. The Selection Official(s) will also sign a conflict of interest statement.

Schedule.

- March 9 and March 17, 2011 – Webinar and Public Conference Call to discuss RFA. See Section IV for further information.
- April 11, 2011 – Submissions must be submitted to EPA or through <http://www.grants.gov> by noon, Central Standard Time. See Section IV for further submission information.
- May 2011 – Begin notifying applicants of selections.
- July 2011 – Begin making official awards.

Dates after April 11, 2011 are expected dates only and may change.

If you register at <http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/maillist> we will send you any updates to GLNPO funding information.

VI. Award Administration

A. Award Notices. Following evaluation of applications, all applicants will be notified regarding their status.

Application Notifications

1. EPA anticipates notification to the *successful* applicant will be made via telephone, email, or postal mail. The notification will advise the applicant that its proposed project has been successfully evaluated and recommended for award. The notification will be made to the contact identified on the Summary Information Page.

This notification, which advises that the applicant's proposed project has been recommended for award, is **not** an authorization to begin performance. The award notice signed by the EPA grants officer is the authorizing document and will be provided through postal mail. This process is generally expected to take 60 to 90 days from the date of recommendation.

2. EPA anticipates notification to *unsuccessful* applicant(s) will be made via email or postal mail. The notification will be made to the contact identified on the Summary Information Page.

B. Administrative and National Policy Requirement. The successful applicant will be required to adhere to the Federal grants requirements, particularly those found in applicable OMB circulars on Cost Principles (A-21, A-87, or A-122), Administrative Requirements (A-102 or 110), and Audit Requirements (A-133) available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants>. This includes government-wide requirements pertaining to accounting standards, lobbying, minority or woman business enterprise, publication, meetings, construction, and disposition of property. EPA regulations governing assistance programs and recipients are codified in Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations. A listing and description of general EPA Regulations applicable to the award of assistance agreements may be viewed at:

http://www.epa.gov/ogd/AppKit/applicable_epa_regulations_and_description.htm

Those requirements, GLNPO-specific requirements currently in effect, and the application materials that will be needed by applicants can also be found online at:

<http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/fund/projreqs.html> and
<http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/fund/appforms.html>.

C. Quality System Documentation. Grants involving the use or collection of environmental data will be required to develop quality system documentation which is required to be delivered within 90 days of award and approved before grantees commence data collection. Applicants should build this requirement into their time lines and budget. Over 90% of the grants awarded in 2010 required quality system documentation. For specific guidance on GLNPO's quality requirements please see www.epa.gov/glnpo/qmp/ .

D. Central Contractor Registration (CCR) and Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) Requirements. Unless exempt from these requirements under OMB guidance at 2 CFR Part 25 (e.g., individuals), each applicant must:

1. Be registered in the CCR prior to submitting an application under this announcement. CCR information can be found at <https://www.bpn.gov/ccr/>
2. Maintain an active CCR registration with current information at all times during which it has an active Federal award or an application under consideration by an agency, and
3. Provide its DUNS number in each application it submits to the agency. Applicants can receive a DUNS number, at no cost, by calling the dedicated toll-free DUNS Number request line at 1-866-705-5711, or visiting the D&B website at: <http://www.dnb.com> .

If an applicant fails to comply with these requirements, it will, should it be selected for award, affect its ability to receive the award.

E. Reporting Requirements. Applicants selected for funding will be asked to provide quarterly or semiannual progress reports addressing financial and work progress and to input data directly into the online [Great Lakes Accountability System](http://restore.glnpo.net/glas_pub/qareport.htm) (see http://restore.glnpo.net/glas_pub/qareport.htm) database, developed for the purpose of collecting and reporting information about the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. (We note that EPA estimated the annual burden associated with GLAS portion of the reporting at 41 hours and \$2,600 per project, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the information.) Special conditions, requiring quarterly and semi-annual financial and progress reporting and a detailed final technical report, will be added to awards. Existing Great Lakes Restoration Initiative reporting requirements, which may be changed by the time of the actual award, can be found in the document at <http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/fund/applicationpac/Help/HI4-Regs-Instructions-9-20-2010.pdf> Applicants should make provision for their expected reporting costs in the budget for their applications.

F. Exchange Network. EPA, states, territories, and tribes are working together to develop the National Environmental Information Exchange Network, a secure, Internet- and standards-based

way to support electronic data reporting, sharing, and integration of both regulatory and non-regulatory environmental data.

States, tribes and territories exchanging data with each other or with EPA, should make the Exchange Network and the Agency's connection to it, the Central Data Exchange (CDX), the standard way they exchange data and should phase out any legacy methods they have been using.

More information on the Exchange Network is available at <http://www.exchangenetwork.net>.

G. Disputes. Assistance agreement competition-related disputes will be resolved in accordance with the dispute resolution procedures published in 70 FR (Federal Register) 3629, 3630 (January 26, 2005) which can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/ogd/competition/resolution.htm>. Copies of these procedures may also be requested by contacting russ.michael@epa.gov

H. Non-profit Administrative Capability and Mandatory Training. Non-profit applicants that are recommended for funding under this announcement are subject to preaward administrative capability reviews consistent with Section 8b, 8c and 9d of EPA Order 5700.8 - Policy on Assessing Capabilities of Non-Profit Applicants for Managing Assistance Awards (http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/award/5700_8.pdf). In addition, non-profit applicants that qualify for funding may, depending on the size of the award, be required to fill out and submit to the Grants Management Office the Administrative Capabilities Form, with supporting documents, contained in Appendix A of EPA Order 5700.8.

EPA requires non-profit recipients to take a course designed to help them understand assistance agreement regulations, the application process, management of their assistance agreements and the close-out process. Completion of this class is mandatory for all non-profit award recipients upon receipt of monetary actions effective October 1, 2007. Certification will be good for 3 years. See <http://www.epa.gov/ogd/>

I. Subaward and Executive Compensation Reporting

Applicants must ensure that they have the necessary processes and systems in place to comply with the sub-award and executive total compensation reporting requirements established under OMB guidance at 2 CFR Part 170, unless they qualify for an exception from the requirements, should they be selected for funding. For additional information, please see 2 CFR Part 170, Reporting Subaward and Executive Compensation Information (<http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov>) and Additional Guidance on Subaward and Executive Compensation on Reporting (<http://www.fsr.gov>).

J. Use of Grant Funds. An applicant that receives an award under this announcement is expected to manage assistance agreement funds efficiently and effectively and make sufficient progress towards completing the project activities described in the work-plan in a timely manner. The assistance agreement will include terms/conditions implementing this requirement.

K. Issuance of Awards. EPA reserves the right to negotiate appropriate changes (that do not affect the integrity of the competition or materially change the application), consistent with EPA Order 5700.5A1 and other applicable policies, in project terms and amounts before making final decisions and awards and reserves the right to reject all applications and make no awards. Applicants may be asked to include greater detail and specificity for their workplans before final awards are issued. Applicants may also be requested to satisfy data quality or peer review requirements before or shortly after awards.

VII. Agency Contacts

Submit questions using the form available from: <http://epa.gov/greatlakes/fund/2011rfa01>

General RFA Contact (for administrative, eligibility, and other general RFA questions):
Michael Russ / 312-886-4013 / RFA2011@glnpa.net

Technical Contacts:

- Toxic Substances and Areas of Concern: Ted Smith / 312-353-6571 / smith.edwin@epa.gov
- Invasive Species: James Schardt 312-353-5085 / schardt.james@epa.gov
- Nearshore Health and Nonpoint Source Pollution: Paul Bertram 312-353-0153 / bertram.paul@epa.gov
- Accountability, Education, Monitoring, Evaluation, Communication, and Partnerships:
Todd Nettesheim 312-353-9153 / nettesheim.todd@epa.gov

Technical Difficulties with Online Submittal

For questions about electronic submittal of applications to the Website:
RFA2011support@glnpa.net or call 617-354-0074 and ask for the GLRI contact.

Other Questions

For other information, including questions about whether applications have been received please use the online form available from: <http://epa.gov/greatlakes/fund/2011rfa01>

VIII. Other Information

Funding for State and Tribal capacity for LaMPs and RAPs is being negotiated separately with States and Tribes. Organizations interested in funding for remediation of contaminated sediments should contact tuchman.marc@epa.gov.

GLNPO will send an e-mail announcement of these and any of its funding opportunities to all who register at <http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/maillist>.

Appendix I – Lakewide Management Plan Priorities and Goals

The Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (GLWQA) calls for the development of action-oriented strategic plans entitled Lakewide Management Plans (LaMPs), agreed to by Great Lakes binational resource managers to protect, restore and maintain the Great Lakes ecosystem. The LaMPs assess, restore, protect, and monitor the ecosystem health of each of the Great Lakes and are used to coordinate the work of all the government, tribal, and non-government partners working to improve the Lake ecosystems. A public consultation process is used to ensure that the LaMPs address the public's concerns. LaMPs for Lakes Ontario, Michigan, Erie, and Superior, the Lake Huron Binational Partnership Action Plan, and the Comprehensive Management Plan for Lake St. Clair identify the goals and priorities for these respective areas and are each considered LaMPs for the purposes of this RFA. The Binational Executive Committee, established through the GLWQA, recently reaffirmed that the LaMPs are the "principal mechanism for binational planning, coordination, and reporting in support of Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement commitments, including the nearshore and open waters."

This following is a summarization of the priorities and goals in the LaMPs and in the ongoing LaMP development processes for Lakes Ontario, Michigan, Erie, and Superior, the Lake Huron Binational Partnership Action Plan, and the Comprehensive Management Plan for Lake St. Clair:

- The Lake Ontario LaMP's recently updated chapters, including the workplan in Chapter 12, can be viewed online in "LaMP 2008" at: http://epa.gov/greatlakes/lamp/lo_2008/index.html. Also available at this site are the annual Lake Ontario Update activities reports. Additional chapters of the LaMP which were not updated in 2008, can be viewed in the "2006 Biennial Report" at <http://epa.gov/greatlakes/lakeont/2006/index.html>. Lake Ontario priorities include reduction of sources and loads of critical pollutants including emerging chemicals; contaminant track-down efforts; coordination of binational monitoring, particularly activities related to LaMP ecosystem indicators; binational Coastal Wetlands Indicators development; restoration of bald eagle and native fish species; development and implementation of watershed management plans addressing nonpoint sources and other lake-wide issues; improved tributary monitoring in AOC and non-AOC areas including but not limited to, measurement of Total Phosphorus, Total Nutrients, chlorophyll a and clarity; development of a management plan to integrate AOC, nearshore and LaMP programs and projects; use of satellite imagery to track large-scale ecosystem changes such as thermal, suspended sediment, chlorophyll a, or other criteria; development of a monitoring protocol for adaptive management for possible changes in Lake Ontario–St. Lawrence River water-level control; and implementation projects supporting the "Lake Ontario Binational Biodiversity Conservation Strategy" including development and implementation of watershed plans to preserve Lake Ontario aquatic biodiversity. The "Strategy" can be found online at : http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/lakeont/reports/lo_biodiversity.pdf
- The Lake Michigan Lakewide Management Plan goals and Sustainability Targets, challenges and next steps can be viewed online at <http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/michigan.html>. The GLRI topics and corresponding LaMP Chapters are: Toxic Substances (contaminated sediments and fish effects LaMP Chapters 1 and 7), Invasive Species (aquatic and terrestrial invasives LaMP Chapter 8), Nearshore Health and Nonpoint Source Pollution (nutrient loadings and land use LaMP and watershed fact sheets Chapters 2, 3, 6, 7, and 12), Habitat

and Wildlife Protection and Restoration (aquatic food web, wetlands, dunes and migration corridors LaMP Chapter 4) and Accountability, Education, Monitoring, Evaluation, Communication and Partnerships (LaMP Chapters 9, 10, and 11). Lake Michigan priorities also include reduction of mining impacts on the ecosystem and development of mapping tools to further implementation of wetland and bio-diversity targets.

- The Lake Erie LaMP can be viewed online at http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/lamp/le_2008. Lake Erie LaMP priorities include an increased understanding of nutrient dynamics in the Western Basin; the development and implementation of management actions to reduce phosphorus loadings to the Western Basin, and monitoring of those actions to determine their success; the development of actions that reduce or lead to the reduction of harmful algal blooms in the Western Basin of Lake Erie; the development of habitat strategies and actions that promote sustainable biodiversity throughout the Lake Erie ecosystem; projects and activities that increase public understanding of the importance of watershed management and how land links to the tributaries to the nearshore of the lake; and actions to encourage sustainable land-usage practices that improve the water quality and habitat of the Lake Erie ecosystem.
- Lake Superior Lakewide Management Plan goals, objectives and challenges can be viewed online at http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/lamp/lis_2008/index.html. Lake Superior priorities include reduction of the nine critical pollutants of the Zero Discharge Demonstration Program; reductions of substances of emerging concern; implementation of the Lake Superior Ecosystem Goals and Objectives; implementation of the Lake Superior Aquatics Invasive Species Complete Prevention Plan; restoration and rehabilitation of native fish populations; habitat restoration and protection; watershed management and plan implementation; reducing mining impacts on the ecosystem; land use change; and climate change adaptation and mitigation efforts.
- Lake Huron Binational Partnership Action Plan goals and priorities can be found online in the Lake Huron Binational Partnership Action Plan at http://www.epa.gov/greatlakes/lamp/lh_2008. Lake Huron Binational Partnership priorities include a reduction of contaminants causing fish consumption advisories; efforts to improve beach quality and management of nearshore algae growth; an increased understanding of how nutrients and energy are partitioned and flow between the nearshore and offshore aquatic environment; restoration of the Lake Huron fishery including lake herring as part of a forage base and lake sturgeon as an historic benthic feeder; restoring connectivity of tributaries, including projects to address dams and barriers accounting for ecological and social values while also taking into account the possible movement of invasive species; protection of cold water tributaries in recognition of a warming climate; and actions that encourage sustainable land-usage practices to improve the water quality and habitat of the Lake Huron ecosystem.
- Lake St. Clair goals and priorities can be found in the Lake St. Clair Comprehensive Management Plan, available online at <http://www.glc.org/stclair>. Lake St. Clair priorities include eliminating sources of bacterial contamination to Lake St. Clair tributaries; developing an Action Plan for identifying, protecting, and restoring important habitat within

the Lake St. Clair watershed; restoring Anchor Bay; shoreline restoration and Phragmites control in Anchor Bay; restoring spawning and nursery habitat in the St. Clair/Detroit River connecting channel; construction of new spawning areas in the St. Clair River Delta; and shoreline softening and wetland creation at the mouth of the Clinton River.

Appendix II

Grants.gov Submission Instructions

The electronic submission of your application through Grants.gov must be made by an authorized official representative (AOR) of your institution who is registered with Grants.gov. For more information, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on “Get Registered” on the left side of the page. *Note that the registration process may take a week or longer to complete.* If your organization is not currently registered with Grants.gov, we encourage them to designate an AOR and ask that individual to begin the registration process as soon as possible.

To begin the application process under this grant announcement, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on the “Apply for Grants” tab on the left side of the page. Then click on “Apply Step 1: Download a Grant Application Package” to download the compatible Adobe viewer and obtain the application package. **To apply through Grants.gov you must use Adobe Reader applications and download the compatible Adobe Reader version (Adobe Reader applications are available to download for free on the Grants.gov website. For more information on Adobe Reader please visit the Help section on Grants.gov at <http://www.grants.gov/help/help.jsp> or http://www.grants.gov/aboutgrants/program_status.jsp).** Once you have downloaded the viewer, you may retrieve the application package by entering the Funding Opportunity Number, EPA-R5-GL2011-1, or the CFDA number that applies to the announcement (CFDA 66.469), in the appropriate field. You may also be able to access the application package by clicking on the Application button at the top right of the synopsis page for this announcement on <http://www.grants.gov> (to find the synopsis page, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on the “Find Grant Opportunities” button on the left side of the page and then go to Search Opportunities and use the Browse by Agency feature to find EPA opportunities).

Application Submission Deadline: Your organization’s AOR must submit your complete application electronically to EPA through Grants.gov (<http://www.grants.gov>) no later than noon Central Standard Time on April 11, 2011.

Please submit the application materials described below.

Application Materials

1. Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)
2. Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs (SF-424A)
3. Assurances for Non-Construction Programs (SF-424B)
4. Grants.gov Lobbying Form
5. EPA Key Contacts Form 5700-54
6. EPA Form 4700-4 – Pre-award Compliance Review Report
7. Narrative Proposal-Project Narrative Attachment Form
8. Other Attachments Form - Resumes or curriculum vitae of Principal Investigators and critical staff
9. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL)
10. Other Attachments Form - Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement
11. Other Attachments Form - Letters of support
12. Other Attachments Form - Meetings/Conferences/Workshops
13. Other Attachments Form - Overarching plan for which there is no Internet link (URL)
14. Other Attachments Form - Scientific peer review
15. Other Attachments Form - Maps or charts.

Application Preparation and Submission Instructions

The application package *must* include items 1 through 7 of the following materials.

1. Standard Form (SF) 424, Application for Federal Assistance. Complete the form. There are no attachments. Please note that the organizational Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Number System (DUNS) number must be included on the SF-424. Organizations may obtain a DUNS number at no cost by calling the toll-free DUNS number request line at 1-866-705-5711.

2. SF-424A, Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs. Complete the form. There are no attachments. The total amount of federal funding requested for the project period should be shown on line 5(e) and on line 6(k) of SF-424A. If indirect costs are included, the amount of indirect costs should be entered on line 6(j). The indirect cost rate (i.e., a percentage), the base (e.g., personnel costs and fringe benefits), and the amount should also be indicated on line 22. If indirect costs are requested, a copy of the Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement must be submitted as part of the application package. (See instructions for document 10 below.)

3. SF-424B, Assurances for Non-Construction Programs. Complete the form. There are no attachments.

4. Grants.gov Lobbying Form – Certification Regarding Lobbying. Complete the form. There are no attachments.

5. EPA Form 5700-54, Key Contacts Form. Complete the form. There are no attachments. If additional pages are needed, attach these additional pages to the electronic application package by using the “Other Attachments Form” in the “Optional Documents” box. (See Application Preparation and Submission Instructions below for more details.)

6. EPA Form 4700-4, Pre-Award Compliance Review Report. Complete the form.

7. Narrative Proposal. Prepared as described in **Section IV.C** of the announcement.

8. Other Attachments Form - Resumes or curriculum vitae of Principal Investigators and critical staff. Use the “Other Attachments Form” in the “Optional Documents” box to attach a copy of the resume or curriculum vitae of principal investigators and critical staff for the proposed project. Such documentation should outline the education, work history, and knowledge/expertise of the individual that relate to managing the proposed project.

9. SF-LLL, Disclosure of Lobbying Activities, if applicable. This form is required if your organization is involved in lobbying. Complete the form if your organization is involved in lobbying activities.

10. Other Attachments Form – Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement. Use if indirect costs are included in the project budget. Use the “Other Attachments Form” in the “Optional Documents” box to attach a copy of your organization’s Indirect Cost Rate Agreement, if applicable. (See Application Preparation and Submission Instructions below for more details.) You must submit a copy of your organization’s Indirect Cost Rate Agreement as part of the application package if your proposed budget includes indirect costs.

11. Other Attachments Form – Support Letters. Use the “Other Attachments Form” in the “Optional Documents” box to attach any relevant letters from collaborators or other letters of support. See RFA Section I.A.1 (Implement Remedial Action Plans in AOCs) for required State support (endorsement) of the project. A letter of support may also be required for non-applicant cost share. Specifically indicate how the supporting organization will assist in the project or what that organization supports, as applicable.

12. Other Attachments Form - Meetings/Conferences/Workshops. If you plan to host meetings, conferences or workshops please include information such as: Who is initiating the meeting? How will it be advertised? Whose logo will be on the agenda and materials? The percentage distribution of the persons attending (i.e. percent federal government, tribal members, public participants, state, local)? Will you be preparing the proceedings or analysis and disseminate this information back to the appropriate community? Do you anticipate any program income being generated, including registration fees?

13. Other Attachments Form – Overarching Plan. Use the “Other Attachments Form” in the “Optional Documents” box to attach a copy of any applicable Overarching Plan for which there is no Internet link (URL). See RFA Section IV.2.C for additional information.

14. Other Attachments Form – Scientific Peer Review. Use the “Other Attachments Form” in the “Optional Documents” box to attach any applicable scientific peer review of the project that has already been completed.

15. Other Attachments Form – Maps or Charts. Use the “Other Attachments Form” in the “Optional Documents” box to attach any applicable maps or charts.

Documents 1 through 7 listed under Application Materials above should appear in the “Mandatory Documents” box on the Grants.gov Grant Application Package page.

For documents 1 through 6, click on the appropriate form and then click “Open Form” below the box. The fields that must be completed will be highlighted in yellow. Optional fields and completed fields will be displayed in white. If you enter an invalid response or incomplete information in a field, you will receive an error message. When you have finished filling out each form, click “Save.” When you return to the electronic Grant Application Package page, click on the form you just completed, and then click on the box that says, “Move Form to Submission List.” This action will move the document over to the box that says, “Mandatory Completed Documents for Submission.”

For document 7, you will need to attach electronic files. Prepare your narrative proposal as described above and save the documents to your computer as a PDF file. When you are ready to attach your proposal to the application package, click on “Project Narrative Attachment Form,” and open the form. Click “Add Mandatory Project Narrative File,” and then attach your proposal (previously saved to your computer) using the browse window that appears. You may then click “View Mandatory Project Narrative File” to view it. Enter a brief descriptive title of your project in the space beside “Mandatory Project Narrative File Filename;” the filename should be no more than 40 characters long. If there are other attachments to submit to accompany your proposal, you may click “Add Optional Project Narrative File” and proceed as before. When you have finished attaching the necessary documents, click “Close Form.” When you return to the “Grant Application Package” page, select the “Project Narrative Attachment Form” and click “Move Form to Submission List.” The form should now appear in the box that says, “Mandatory Completed Documents for Submission.”

Documents 8 through 15 are listed in the “Optional Documents” box, but *please note that these so-called “optional” documents must also be submitted as part of the application package, if applicable to your organization or the category to which you are submitting your application.* You must submit document 8 – Resumes or curriculum vitae of Principal Investigators and critical staff. You are only required to submit document 9 – SF-LLL, Disclosure of Lobbying Activities – if your organization is involved in lobbying activities. You are required to submit document 10 – Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement – if you have included any indirect costs in your proposed budget. You are required to submit document 11 – Support Letters – only if necessary to indicate State endorsement of AOC projects or to confirm non-applicant cost share. Items 13-15 are optional. To attach documents 8-15, use the “Other Attachments Form” in the “Optional Documents” box. After attaching the documents, please remember to highlight the “Other Attachments Form” and click “Move Form to Submission List” in order to move the documents to the box that says, “Optional Completed Documents for Submission.”

Once you have finished filling out all of the forms/attachments and they appear in one of the “Completed Documents for Submission” boxes, click the “Save” button that appears at the top of the Web page. It is suggested that you save the document a second time, using a different name, since this will make it easier to submit an amended package later if necessary. Please use the following format when saving your file: “Applicant Name – FY11 – Focus Area.Category⁷ – 1st Submission” or “Applicant Name – FY11 – Focus Area . Category – Back-up

⁷ In your submission, replace “Focus Area. Category” with the applicable abbreviation below to the right:

Focus Area	Category in RFA	Focus Area.Category
I.A. Toxic Substances and Areas of Concern		
	I.A.1. Delist Areas of Concern/Beneficial Use Impairments	TX.DelistAOC
	I.A.2. Pollution Prevention and Toxics Reduction	TX.P2
I.B. Invasive Species		
	I.B.1. Invasive Species Control	IS.Control
	I.B.2. Invasive Species Prevention	IS.Prevent
	I.B.3. Early Warning System for Invasive Species	IS.EarlyWarning

Submission.” If it becomes necessary to submit an amended package at a later date, then the name of the 2nd submission should be changed to “Applicant Name – FY11 – Focus Area.Category – 2nd Submission.”

Once your application package has been completed and saved, send it to your AOR for submission to EPA through Grants.gov. Please advise your AOR to close all other software programs before attempting to submit the application package through Grants.gov.

In the “Application Filing Name” box, your AOR should enter your organization’s name (abbreviate where possible), the fiscal year (e.g., FY11), and the grant activity category (e.g., TX.DelistAOC). The filing name should not exceed 40 characters. From the “Grant Application Package” page, your AOR may submit the application package by clicking the “Submit” button that appears at the top of the page. The AOR will then be asked to verify the agency and funding opportunity number for which the application package is being submitted. If problems are encountered during the submission process, the AOR should reboot his/her computer before trying to submit the application package again. [It may be necessary to turn off the computer (not just restart it) before attempting to submit the package again.] If the AOR continues to experience submission problems, he/she may contact Grants.gov for assistance by phone at 1-800-518-4726 or email at <http://www.grants.gov/help/help.jsp> or he/she may contact Lawrence Brail via email at brail.lawrence@epa.gov.

Applications submitted through <http://www.grants.gov> will be time and date stamped electronically.

I.C. Nearshore Health and Nonpoint Source Pollution		
	I.C.1. Project Implementation to Make Beaches Safer	NS.BeachSS
	I.C.2. Reduce Impairments and Stressors of Nearshore Waters	NS.ReduceImprnts
	I.C.3. Watershed Remediation	NS.BMP
	I.C.4. Clean Marinas and Ports	NS.Marina
	I.C.5. Areal Extent and Duration of Harmful Algal Blooms	NS.HAB
I.D. Accountability, Education, Monitoring, Evaluation, Communication, and Partnerships		
	I.D.1. Education and Outreach	AEMECP.Ed
	I.D.2. Implement Lakewide Management Plan Projects	AEMECP.LaMP

Appendix III Budget Sample

Budget Detail

This section of the work plan is a detailed description of the budget found in the SF-424A, and must include a detailed discussion of how EPA funds will be used. Applicants must **itemize** costs related to personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contractual costs, other direct costs, indirect costs, and total costs.

If the project budget includes any voluntary cost share, the Budget Detail portion of the narrative proposal must include a detailed description of how the applicant will obtain the cost-share and how the cost-share funding will be used. If EPA accepts an offer for a voluntary cost-share, applicants must meet their sharing commitment as a legal condition of receiving EPA funding. If the proposed cost-share is to be provided by a third-party, a letter of commitment is required. Any form of cost-share included in the Budget Detail must also be included on the SF 424 and SF 424A. Please see Section III.B if this RFP for more detailed information on cost-share.

Applicants should use the following instructions, budget object class descriptions, and example table to complete the Budget Detail section of the work plan. Use only whole dollar amounts.

□ Personnel - List all staff positions by title. Give annual salary, percentage of time assigned to the project, and total cost for the budget period. This category includes only direct costs for the salaries of those individuals who will perform work directly for the project (generally, paid employees of the applicant organization). If the applicant organization is including staff time (in-kind services) as a cost share, this should be included as Personnel costs. Personnel costs do not include: (1) costs for services of consultants, contractors, consortia members, or other partner organizations, which are included in the “Contractual” category; (2) costs for employees of subrecipients under subawards, which are included in the “Other” category; or (3) effort that is not directly in support of the proposed project, which may be covered by the organization’s negotiated indirect cost rate. The budget detail must identify the personnel category type by Full Time Equivalent (FTE), including percentage of FTE for part-time employees, number of personnel proposed for each category, and the estimated funding amounts.

□ Fringe Benefits - Identify the percentage used, the basis for its computation, and the types of benefits included. Fringe benefits are allowances and services provided by employers to their employees as compensation in addition to regular salaries and wages. Fringe benefits include, but are not limited to the cost of leave, employee insurance, pensions and unemployment benefit plans.

□ Travel - Specify the mileage, per diem, estimated number of trips in-State and out-of-State and international (include specific international locations), number of travelers, and other costs for each type of travel. Travel may be integral to the purpose of the proposed project (e.g. inspections) or related to proposed project activities (e.g. attendance at meetings). Travel costs do not include: (1) costs for travel of consultants, contractors, consortia members, or

other partner organizations, which are included in the “Contractual” category; (2) travel costs for employees of subrecipients under subawards, which are included in the “Other” category.

□ **Equipment - Identify each item to be purchased which has an estimated acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more per unit and a useful life of more than one year.** Equipment also includes accessories necessary to make the equipment operational. Equipment does not include: (1) equipment planned to be leased/rented, including lease/purchase agreement; or (2) equipment service or maintenance contracts. These types of proposed costs should be included in the “Other” category. Items with a unit cost of less than \$5,000 should be categorized as supplies, pursuant to 40 CFR 31.3 and 30.2. The budget detail must include an itemized listing of all equipment proposed under the project.

□ **Supplies - “Supplies” means all tangible personal property other than “equipment”.** The budget detail should identify categories of supplies to be procured (e.g., laboratory supplies or office supplies). Non-tangible goods and services associated with supplies, such as printing service, photocopy services, and rental costs should be included in the “Other” category.

□ **Contractual - Identify each proposed contract and specify its purpose and estimated cost.** Contractual/consultant services are those services to be carried out by an individual or organization, other than the applicant, in the form of a procurement relationship. Leased or rented goods (equipment or supplies) should be included in the “Other” category. The applicant should list the proposed contract activities along with a brief description of the scope of work or services to be provided, proposed duration, and proposed procurement method (competitive or noncompetitive), if known.

□ **Other - List each item in sufficient detail for EPA to determine the reasonableness and allowability of its cost.** This category should include only those types of direct costs that do not fit in any of the other budget categories. Examples of costs that may be in this category are: insurance, rental/lease of equipment or supplies, equipment service or maintenance contracts, printing or photocopying, rebates, and subaward costs. Subawards (e.g., subgrants) are a distinct type of cost under this category. The term “subaward” means an award of financial assistance (money or property) by any legal agreement made by the recipient to an eligible subrecipient. This term does not include procurement purchases, technical assistance in the form of services instead of money, or other assistance in the form of revenue sharing, loans, loan guarantees, interest subsidies, insurance, or direct appropriations. Subcontracts are not subawards and belong in the contractual category. Applicants must provide the aggregate amount they propose to issue as subaward work and a description of the types of activities to be supported.

□ **Indirect Charges - If indirect charges are budgeted, indicate the approved rate and base.** Indirect costs are those incurred by the grantee for a common or joint purpose that benefit more than one cost objective or project, and are not readily assignable to specific cost objectives or projects as a direct cost. In order for indirect costs to be allowable, the applicant must have a federal or state negotiated indirect cost rate (e.g., fixed, predetermined, final or provisional), or must have submitted a proposal to the cognizant Federal or State agency. Examples of Indirect Cost Rate calculations are shown below:

o Personnel (Indirect Rate x Personnel = Indirect Costs)

o Personnel and Fringe (Indirect Rate x Personnel & Fringe = Indirect Costs)

- o Total Direct Costs (Indirect Rate x Total direct costs = Indirect Costs)
- o Direct Costs minus distorting or other factors such as contracts and equipment
(Indirect Rate x (total direct cost – distorting factors) = Indirect Costs)

Example Budget Table

	EPA Funding	Cost-Share
Personnel		
(1) Project Manager @ \$40/hr x 10 hrs/week x 52 wks		\$20,800
(5) Project Staff @ \$30/hr x 40 hrs/week x 40 wks	\$244,000	
TOTAL PERSONNEL	\$244,000	\$20,800
Fringe Benefits		
20% of Salary and Wages	20%(\$244,000)	20%(20,800)
- Retirement, Health Benefits, FICA, SUI	\$48,800	\$4,160
TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS	\$48,800	\$4,160
Travel		
in State travel for Project Manager and staff: 500 mi/mo @ \$0.55/mi x 12 mos.	\$3,300	
Out of State (IL, WI, IA) Travel for Project Staff: 20 trips per month x \$2,500 per trip	\$600,000	
SOLEC Meeting (Toronto, Canada) Travel for Project Manager: 2 trips per year x \$3,500 per trip	\$7,000	
TOTAL TRAVEL	\$610,300	
Equipment		
Transducer, coupling, and software package	\$25,700	
Electrofishing boom shocker (2 x \$7,500each)	\$15,000	
1 Project Vehicle	\$25,000	
1 Project Boat	\$15,000	
TOTAL EQUIPMENT	81,100	
Supplies		
Office and related supplies to support training	\$400	
Office computer and printer	\$2,500	
TOTAL SUPPLIES	\$2,900	
Contractual		
ABC Support Services Contract	\$100,000	
XYZ Land & Water Conservation	\$66,400	
TOTAL CONTRACTUAL	\$166,400	
Other		
Travel for 3 representatives to attend workshop training – 100 trips x \$1,000 each	\$100,000	
Travel for 4 representatives to attend workshop training – 200 trips x \$2,000 each	\$400,000	
TOTAL OTHER	\$500,000	
Indirect Charges		
Federal Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate = 10% (Indirect Rate x Personnel = Indirect Costs; as negotiated)	\$26,480	
TOTAL INDIRECT	\$26,480	
TOTAL FUNDING	\$1,679,580	\$24,960
TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$1, 704,540	

** Any voluntary cost-share funds, while not required under this RFA, must also be included on the SF-424A as detailed in Section III.B of this RFA. Federal funds are not allowed to be used for cost share, please identify the source of the cost share in your budget narrative.

Note on Management Fees: When formulating budgets for proposals, applicants must not include management fees or similar charges in excess of the direct costs and indirect costs at the rate approved by the applicant's cognizant Federal audit agency, or at the rate provided for by the terms of the agreement negotiated with EPA. The term "management fees or similar charges" refers to expenses added to the direct costs in order to accumulate and reserve funds for ongoing business expenses, unforeseen liabilities, or for other similar costs that are not allowable under EPA assistance agreements. Management fees or similar charges cannot be used to improve or expand the project funded under this agreement, except to the extent authorized as a direct cost of carrying out the work plan.